A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES:

CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL AND HOMILETICAL,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS.

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D.

IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, AND EDITED, WITH ADDITIONS ORIGINAL AND SELECTED,

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

IN CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN DIVINES OF VARIOUS EVANGELICAL DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. IX. OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: CONTAINING THE EPISTLES GENERAL OF JAMES, PETER, JOHN AND JUDE.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER, & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1867.

THE

EPISTLE GENERAL OF JAMES.

BY

J. P. LANGE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN,

AND

J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF UTRECHT.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND REVISED GERMAN EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS ORIGINAL AND SELECTED,

BY

J. ISIDOR MOMBERT, D.D.,

RECTOR OF ST. JAMES'S CHURCH, LANCASTER, PA.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER, & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1867.

Stereotyped by
JAS. B. RODGERS,
PHILADELPHIA.

The New York Printing Company,
81, 83, and 85 Centre Street,
New York.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

In the preparation of this Commentary on the Catholic Epistles no pains have been spared to make it useful to Anglo-American readers. More than three years of labour have been bestowed upon it; and the translation of several Epistles, originally made from the *earlier* German editions, has been carefully revised by the *latest*. The *addenda* are numerous, and have entailed a vast amount of work. They will speak for themselves. It is hoped that the readings of the *Codex Siniaticus*, uniformly embodied in this Commentary, the constant reference to the best English and other divines, ancient and modern, and the extracts from their comments on this section of the New Testament, will place the reader in possession of every element necessary to the understanding of these Epistles.

I have endeavoured faithfully to comply with the general principles regulating the translation; and if the reproduction of the style of four different writers presented peculiar difficulties, it is gratifying to me that none of the Catholic Epistles in Lange's Commentary have ever before been translated into English. The diversity of style, to which I have just referred, will be especially apparent in the Introduction and the Critical and Exegetical portions of the Epistles of St. James, from the pen of Dr. Lange. He has an extraordinary genius for word-coining, and some of his combinations are so graphic, telling and original, that I have deemed it proper to reproduce them in English for the reason that these somewhat grotesque and strange-looking words have often the effect of stimulating the mental activity of the reader. The context is generally their commentary; where this was not the case in the original, due recourse has been had to periphrastic explanations.

On many questions I differ from the authors, and the addenda are mostly made to remove onesidedness of statement. In numerous instances, however, I hesitated to express my dissent, because I did not think it fair to carry on a controversy with them in the pages of their own works. I am only responsible for the matter in brackets, [ ], marked M.

May the Divine blessing rest upon my humble endeavours to aid in the elucidation of this important and interesting section of the Inspired Volume!

To the reader I would say: "*Errores pauci fuerint si forte libello,—errores paucos tollat amica manus!*"

J. Isidor Mombert.

Lancaster, Pa., April 1, 1867.

DR. LANGE'S

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION OF JAMES.

THIS Commentary on the Epistle of James is the joint work of my respected friend, Dr. van Oosterzee and myself. The Introduction, the translation and the Critical and Exegetical notes, are my work; the Doctrinal and Homiletical sections have been supplied by Dr. van Oosterzee. I heartily thank my friend and collaborator for the cheerful and valuable help he has thus far bestowed upon this Commentary.

With respect to the sections undertaken by me, there were especially two reasons which made the work one of peculiar interest to me. In the first place, I was anxious to improve this opportunity to testify against the old Ebionito-apocryphal fiction of non-apostolic brothers of the Lord, who were, at the same time, held in high Apostolic repute. In the second place I desired to express my conviction that the Epistle of James (like the First Epistle of Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews) cannot be sufficiently appreciated unless the history of the world, at the time when it was written, be constantly referred to, viz., the beginnings of that great Jewish revolution against the Romans, which, with its national sympathies, was, to the Jews in general, a great temptation to become hardened, and to the Jewish Christians an equal temptation to apostasy. This historical reference, hitherto neglected, in my opinion, can only prove advantageous to the exposition of this Epistle. In this sense I have been working; may the fundamental thought of my work be attested by blessed results.

I only add that I did not expect that my honoured collaborator would forthwith apply in the Doctrinal and Homiletical sections the aforesaid points of view, which have still to fight for recognition among theologians. On the contrary I thought it most desirable that the universal side of the Epistle should be fully developed in the Doctrinal and Homiletical sections without special reference to its historical points; and, indeed, the independence of my friend, led me to expect an execution of his work carried out in this sense. The Commentary, as a whole, has doubtless gained in allsidedness by this recognition of the universal by the side of the historical point of view.

DR. LANGE'S

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION OF JAMES.

My respected friend and coöperator, Dr. van Oosterzee, has charged me to represent him also in this Preface to the second edition. The first thing to be said imports the assurance that each has carefully, revised, and here and there rectified or improved his respective part, without subjecting the original shape of the work to unnecessary changes.

Since the publication of the first edition Dr. van Oosterzee has been called and translated to Utrecht in the capacity of *Professor ordinarius* of Theology; he himself has thus occasioned the first and very gratifying change on the title-page. Another call, namely, the removal of our friend, the Rev. Chantepie de la Saussaye, from Leyden to Rotterdam, had, alas, the consequence that the note on page 5 of the first edition [not inserted in the translation for this very reason—M.] could not be fulfilled, according to which he had undertaken the preparing of the Johannean Epistles, but found himself for an indefinite period prevented to carry his task into effect. But, by the help of God, said section of this Commentary passed from one competent hand to another. Our whole work, moreover, has lately made considerable progress; the publishers, as well as the authors, may look back upon the road already traversed, with cheerful gratitude, and forward to the goal with increasing hope.

With reference to exegesis there have appeared since the publication of the first edition in 1862, four theological novelties in our field of labour, which deserve to be noticed: The second edition of the *Commentary on James*, from the pen of Dr. Huther, appeared in 1863; last year the third edition of the respective section of de Wette's *Handbook*, prepared by Dr. Brückner; in the same year also a new commentary, of considerable extent, on this Epistle, from the pen of the lately deceased venerable Professor Bouman of Utrecht, published after his death by his sons under the title of "*Hermanni Bouman, Theol. Dr. et in Acad. Rhenotraject. Prof. Ord. Commentarius perpetuus in Jacobi Epistolam post. mortem auctoris editus. Trajecti ad Rhenum apud Kemink et Filium*, 1865." To these Commentaries must be added the publication of the *Codex Sinaiticus*.

The second edition of Huther's *Commentary on the Epistle of James*, having been concluded as early as October, 1862, has not led to reciprocal discussions between it and our exegetical work. Interesting is Huther's discussion with his reviewer, Professor Frank of Erlangen, introduced into the preface owing to the circumstance that his reviewer misconstrued the statement that Paul also teaches a consideration of works in the final judgment. Dr. Brückner has referred to our work both in the Introduction and in his exposition. The circumstance, that we could not move that highly-esteemed theologian to pronounce in favour of the radical modifications of the exegesis of this Epistle, in consequence of the definite historical construction which we have put on it, does not disturb us or fill us with doubt; it must also be borne in mind that he had to deal with the revision of a book which, as the preparation of a mandatary work, imposed upon him the most rigid self-constraint. In opposition to our statement that the author designed to fortify the Jewish Christians against the already roused revolutionary spirit of the Jews, without incautiously drawing the impending revolution in over-distinct colours, Brückner simply contends

that then the "political fanaticism" ought at least to have been touched in the Epistle. In reply we have to observe, that it is characteristic of the apostolical wisdom of the author to oppose political fanaticism only in its religious motives and roots. These motives and roots, however, appear plain enough by replies to the following questions: 1. Which was the greatest *common cause* of all the twelve tribes of the Jews in part believing, in part still receptive of belief, during the sixth decade after the birth of Christ? 2. Which could be the manifold common temptations which through patience and steadfastness they were to change into all joy? Or, to be still briefer, which was at that time the common great trial of faith of the twelve tribes? And wherein had, consequently, the common proof to consist? 3. Why does the Apostle, after the general warning against representing the general temptation as a temptation from God, *i. e.* as a provocation, pass at once to the condemnation of wrath? 4. And what, in particular, is the import of the warning in chapter iii. 13 sqq., which even progresses to the naming of *ἀκαταστασία* as the result of *ζῆλος* and *ἐριθεία*? Similar questions arise from each separate section of our Epistle in opposition to the *non-historical* construction of our Epistle as being merely a collection of edifying exhortations to good moral conduct, but where it is anything but edifying that the author straightway assumes that the poor were disregarded at worship and otherwise neglected in all the twelve tribes of the dispersion, and that the rich Christians were guilty of conduct that he felt justified or rather constrained to utter a woe on them. We reiterate the expression of our conviction, that the non-appreciation of the historical motives and prophetico-symbolical phraseology of the Epistle leaves its great one fundamental thought well-nigh unopened, and this is proved by the extraordinary misconstructions which have been put upon it.

Bouman, the venerable veteran of Dutch theology, who left his Commentary in manuscript, like a testament, to the care of his sons, has first of all gladdened us by the decisiveness and scientific force with which he represents in the Introduction the view that the author of our Epistle could have been none other than the Apostle Jacobus Alphaei. May this example be a sign that theological science begins to turn away from the all-confounding and self-confused prejudice, that a non-apostolical James had risen to the highest apostolical repute in the apostolical Church, because he was a brother of the Lord according to the flesh, who at a late period became converted to the faith. We discover also a welcome agreement of the author with this Commentary in the assumption that the Epistle, though primarily addressed to Jewish Christians, had also the secondary design of converting the receptive Jews to the faith; and that this circumstance accounts also for the prophetical colouring of the Epistle. His attaching particular importance to the parallelism between the Apostle as the head of the Church at Jerusalem and the High priest with reference to the Jewish dispersion, appears to us as not unfounded; but the hypothesis that the Epistle dates from the earliest time of the propagation of Christianity, does not induce us to change the view expressed by us in this respect in this Commentary, or to fortify it by the production of new arguments. The exposition itself resembles variously the Scholia-form, and moves in the track of the customary general and abstract construction of the Epistle, takes, however, in a learned and independent manner, cognizance of modern exegetes, and manifests also with reference to the *Codex Sinaiticus* a free critical judgment.

The readings of the *Sinaiticus*, wherever they appeared to be important, have mostly been added to the critical notes.

May the joint preparation of this Epistle continue to be blessed in promoting the vital appreciation of the glorious totality of the Scripture as the Word of God, which appreciation must be consummated in the belief that all the writings of Paul and of James are in perfect agreement with one another, and with the whole Scripture.

THE EDITOR.

Bonn, ***January* 6, 1866.**

THE

EPISTLE GENERAL OF JAMES.

INTRODUCTION.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES BEING THE FIRST AMONG THE SO-CALLED CATHOLIC EPISTLES, IT IS NECESSARY TO FOUND THE PARTICULAR INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLE OF JAMES ON A MORE GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

I. THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES IN GENERAL.

1. THE TERM "CATHOLIC EPISTLES" AND THEIR STATUS (GERM. *Bestand*).

The term "Catholic Epistles" embraces the seven Apostolic Epistles, which, besides the Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews added to them, are found in the Canon of the New Testament; namely the Epistle of James, the two Epistles of Peter, the three Epistles of John and the Epistle of Jude.

According to the primary and original meaning of *ἐπιστολὴ καθολική*, it denotes an encyclical writing, which as such was primarily addressed not to individual Churches or persons, but to a larger ecclesiastical sphere, to a number of Churches. In this sense Clement of Alexandria (*Stromat.* iv.) calls the Epistle of the Apostles and of the Church at Jerusalem addressed to Christian congregations according to Acts xv. 22-29 an *ἐπιστολὴ καθολική*. So Origen (*contra Celsum* i. 63) calls the Epistle of Barnabas, the contents of which characterize it an encyclical writing, *καθολική*. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 18) reports that Apollonius reproached Themison, the Montanist, with having written in imitation of the Apostle (probably John) an *ἐπιστολὴ καθολική*. This shows that the universal character of the First Epistle of John was designated by the term 'Catholic' as early as the time of Apollonius, that is: in the beginning of the third century. Even Origen applies this designation in this sense to the First Epistle of John (*in the Commentary of John*), to the First Epistle of Peter (according to Euseb. vi. 25), and to the Epistle of Jude, but in passages which are found only in a Latin translation (*Comment. in epist. ad Roman.*). In the time of Eusebius, the term 'Catholic' was already applied to the whole group of Epistles, which we call Catholic. "James," he says "is said to have written the first of the Catholic Epistles;" and then adverts to "the seven Epistles called Catholic." (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23). The meaning "Epistles more general as to their contents and object," which Guerike considers to be primary, could only be secondary, because it generally resulted from the nature of the encyclical writing; for the very first Catholic Epistle (Acts xv.) was not general as to its object and contents. There was but one step from changing the originally somewhat general character of these circular letters which assigned to them a more enlarged sphere of the Church, into one altogether general. Thus the Apostolical Epistle (Acts xv.) was already destined to apply to the whole Gentile-Christian Church, while the Epistle of James and probably that to the Hebrews were designed for the whole Jewish-Christian Church. In this sense, Oecumenius (*Prolegom. in Epist. Jacob.*) declared that they had been called 'Catholic,' inasmuch as they had

not been addressed to a particular people or city, like the Epistles of Paul, but to believers in general (as a whole, καθόλου), whether to Jewish Christians of the dispersion or even to all Christians, as members of the same faith.

In the Western Church the term *epistolæ canonicæ* instead of *catholicæ* obtained great currency from the time of Junilius and Cassiodorus (see Credner, *Introd.* p. 570). That this could not have been the original sense follows decisively from the fact that Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23) applies the term 'Catholic' also to the Epistles of Dionysius of Corinth to the Churches at Lacedæmon, Athens, etc. But Eusebius probably combined also here with the idea of the encyclical character the idea of the universal, for he remarked concerning said Dionysius and his Epistle, "that he was most useful to all (ἅπασιν absolutely) in the Catholic Epistles which he addressed to the Churches." Yet Eusebius gave already occasion that the idea of general reception or canonicity was combined with the idea of partial or entire universality by saying of the First Epistle of Peter: "The First Epistle of Peter is universally acknowledged, but the Acts of Peter, the Gospel according to Peter, the Preaching and the Revelation of Peter are not among the Catholic writings." [*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 3—M.].—It is evident that neither the idea of universality nor that of canonicity could be applied absolutely to the Catholic Epistles as contrasted with those of Paul. If they were called universal, the reference was to their more general tenor, if they were called canonical, the reference was at once to their more general contents and to their direct general authority, without any intention of seeking thereby to weaken the less direct universality and canonicity of the Pauline Epistles.

Besides this definition of the term 'Catholic Epistles,' another has arisen in modern times, Hug in his *Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament* ii. p. 429 observes as follows: "After the Gospels and the Acts had been referred to one division and the writings of St. Paul to another, there were still remaining the writings of different authors which might again be collected under one head and had to be distinguished by a name of their own. They might most aptly be called καθολικὸν σύνταγμα of the Apostles and the writings contained in it κοιναί and καθολικαί, these two words being frequently used as synonymes by Greek writers." In proof of this statement, Hug brings forward the declaration of Clement of Alexandria concerning the Apostolical Epistle, Acts xv. 23, namely, the Catholic Epistle in which all the Apostles took part. But τῶν ἀποστόλων πάντων has not the meaning which Hug discovers in it. He then cites the judgment of Eusebius that the "First Epistle of Peter is universally acknowledged, but the Acts of Peter, the Gospel according to Peter, the Preaching and Revelation of Peter are not among the Catholic writings." This, according to Hug, denotes the class to which the Apostolical writings in general were then referred. But the citation from Eusebius established rather the contrast between writings acknowled and writings not acknowledged. The circumstance, finally, that the Epistle of Barnabas is called Catholic, he tries to account for by the assertion that Barnabas also was sometimes called an Apostle. But the true explanation must be sought in its contents, for in the time of Origen, the Epistle of Barnabas was neither acknowledged as Apostolical nor as Canonical. In the sense of Hug, it has also been attempted to draw a parallel between the origin of the Canon of the Old Testament and that of the Canon of the New. For it is maintained that as in the formation of the Canon of the Old Testament, after the Thorah and the Prophets had been collected under their respective heads, the remaining sacred writings, in general, were collected under the head of Hagiographa; so, in the formation of the Canon of the New Testament, after the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles (εὐαγγέλιον and ἀπόστολος) had been collected, the remaining sacred writings of the New Testament were collected under the head "Catholic Epistles," *i. e.* writings of the New Testament in general (καθόλου).—Apart from possible objections to that view of the Old Testament, it is self-evident that in that case the reference ought to have been to Catholic *writings* and not to Catholic *Epistles*, and that then both the Revelation and the Epistle to the Hebrews ought to have been included in the last-named class.

Credner gives the following natural account of the old arrangement of the Canon of the New Testament: "First historical notices of Jesus (the Gospels); then such notices of the Apostles; then general (catholic) Epistles of the Apostles; then Epistles to separate congregations

and to individuals (the Epistles of Paul). This primary arrangement originated in a clear perception of what was collected and why it was collected."

But the ideal principle of division has evidently been modified by historical relations. A division purely made with reference to subject-matter, would require the Epistle to the Ephesians and that to the Hebrews to be included among the Catholic Epistles, the second and third Epistles of John to be excluded from them. The latter, however, were considered as supplemental to the first Epistle of John, and the former retained by the great mass of the Pauline Epistles, as it were, by attraction.

2. THE IMPORT OF THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES IN THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Catholic Epistles, comprehending only a small part of the New Testament Canon, are of the utmost importance on account of the completeness and fulness of that part. As the four Gospels are designed mutually to complement each other, so here the types of the doctrine of James, Peter and John, complement the type of the doctrine of Paul. By this complementing they preserve the Christian consciousness from a one-sided culture of the Pauline expression; by the variety and fulness of their modes of treatment and expression, they guarantee the fulness of Christian cognition and the full vitality and motion of the churchly spirit. Paul has been called the Apostle of faith; John the Apostle of love, Peter the Apostle of hope. This is a very imperfect mode of distinction, because, to name only one reason, it is exclusively Pauline; it denotes, nevertheless, the riches of the Apostolical complements furnished by the Catholic Epistles. These Epistles, moreover, are highly important as mirroring the condition of the Church during the latter period of the Apostolic age. In this respect they constitute an indispensable connecting-link between the Acts and the Pauline Epistles (excepting the Pastoral Epistles to which they are intimately related) on the one hand, and the Apocalypse and the Apostolical Fathers on the other.—While in the Book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles, we have the exhibition of the external diversity of the Churches which were springing up every where, as yet predominating over the certainly existing internal unity, the encyclical character of most of these Epistles (as also of that to the Hebrews) gives already greater prominence to the consciousness of a full, and moreover, of an external unity of the Church. This holds also good of the Epistle of James, for he addresses Christendom of Jewish origin not as an Ebionite Jewish-Christian but as an Apostle. These Epistles moreover acquaint us with the further developments of Church-life in the Apostolic age; with the springing up of the Ebionite and Gnostic weeds among the wheat of pure doctrine, and on the other hand, with the development of the more distinct, the dogmatically more conscious Apostolic and church-testimony. Ebionitism is perfectly drawn in symbolical characters not sufficiently appreciated—in the Epistle of James (ch. ii. 2, etc.), in the first Epistle of John (ch. ii. 22, etc.), and probably also in the third of John (v. 9); Gnostic libertinism, on the other hand, is condemned in the Epistle of Jude, in the second of Peter (ch. ii.), and in 1 Jno. iv. 1, etc. With respect to ecclesiastical constitution, our Epistles confirm the identity of the Presbyterate and the Episcopate; but the dignity of the presbyter-bishop becomes more distinct in the position taken by Jude, James, John (2 Jno. 1) and Peter. That is, we have to deal with Apostolical men who, as leading presbyters, had even then entered upon close relations with specific ecclesiastical circles; this applies at least to James and John. We also obtain hints of the form of worship (Jude 12; 2 Pet. ii. 13), and of a certain method and gradation in the presentation of Christian doctrine (1 Jno. ii. 12, etc.).

With respect to the relation of the different New Testament types of doctrine, so richly represented in the Catholic Epistles, we take for granted that in this field a conflict of doctrine is impossible but that differences of doctrine, various types, *i. e.* individual views, conceptions and modes of statement are necessary. All the Apostles are agreed in that they see in Christianity the New Testament, that is: 1, the fulfilment and therein the harmonious contrast of the Old Testament, the completed religion of revelation; 2, the fulfilment and contrast of all incomplete religions in general, the perfect religion absolutely; 3, consequently they see in the New Testament the primeval, even the everlasting Testament, the everlasting religion which, while it must branch out into the two æons of struggling development and of glorious consummation, our

nevermore be followed by another religion. In these respects James is not by a hair's breadth less evangelical (German: *neutestamentlich*) than Paul and John.

The New Testament, according to all the New Testament types of doctrine, is the fulfilment, the real form, therefore, of the religion which the Old Testament had traced in the symbolical shadow.

Christianity is the fulfilment of the law of the Old Testament, hence the royal law of love, the law of liberty, of spiritual life, of unity; such is the teaching of James.

Christianity is the fulfilment of the theocracy of the Old Testament, hence the real kingdom of God, the real royal priesthood, which, first a kingdom of suffering, finds its consummation in a kingdom of glory; such is the teaching of Peter.

Christianity is the fulfilment of the old Covenant, of the sacraments of the Old Testament, hence the real circumcision and regeneration, hence the real passover, the real redemption and the real new human life as the principle of a real new world of the resurrection, the New Covenant of faith and the new covenant-jubilee of the communion of faith; such is the teaching of Paul.

Christianity is the fulfilment of the worship of the Old Testament, hence the real eternal Divine worship of the completed word, of the completed Sabbath, of completed sacrifice and of the completed festive-church (Germ: *Fest-Gemeinde.*); such is—closely following Paul—the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Christianity is the fulfilment of all the symbolism of the Old Testament, and of all the symbolism of primitive monotheism (Germ.- *Urmonotheismus*) in general, on which the Old Testament is founded, hence the real new world in the development of its glorification (Germ. *Verklärung*) by the Personal Word in the threefold lustre of real light, real love and real life; such is the teaching of John.

The Epistles of Peter (on the character of Peter see my *Apostol. Age*, I., p. 354, and the Article "*Petrus*," in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædia*,) are connected with the speeches of Peter in Acts, and the Petrine Gospel of Mark. They form a connecting link between the doctrine of James and that of Paul.

The fundamental idea of the FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER is ch. i. 3, 4, the regeneration of Christians out of suffering unto an incorruptible inheritance (*Land of inheritance and kingdom of inheritance*). The division is as follows:

Introduction: The new hope of the spiritual Israel flowing from the resurrection of Christ from the dead, ch. i. 1–3. The theme already specified, ch. i. 4.

I. Believers destined for this blessedness of the inheritance, ch. i. 5–9.

II. The Old Testament pointing to this inheritance, v. 10–12.

III. The pilgrimage of the spiritual Israel to this goal. Their sanctification. Their redemption. Their brotherly love on the ground of their common heavenly descent by means of regeneration, ch. i. 13–25.

IV. The New Covenant. The preparation of the New Testament. Christ the living stone, antitype of Sinai. Christians, the new theocracy ch. ii. 1–10.

V. The wilderness-pilgrims (v. 11) and their behaviour towards pagans; *a.* according to the relations of the pagans, v. 12–17; *b.* according to the relations of the Christians. The behaviour of enslaved men (*males*); that of wives, especially in mixed marriages, ch. ii. 18—iii. 2.

VI. The behaviour of Christians among themselves, ch. iii. 3–8.

VII. Their behaviour towards persecutors, ch. iii. 9–22.

VIII. Readiness and blessedness of suffering, ch. iv.

IX. The proper relation of the leaders of the flock of God and those who are led, especially as the proper preparation against the adversary, ch. v. 1–9. Conclusion, Benediction and Salutation, v. 10–14.

But compare the First Epistle of Peter in this commentary. As to its literature, we have still to mention *Schott's* commentary, which has recently appeared. Erlangen 1861.

With respect to the SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER, we refer to our work, "The Apostolical Age" (*Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, Vol. I., p. 156). We continue to maintain the hypothesis there advanced, that the Epistle of Jude according to its contents was at a later period inserted in

the original Epistle of Peter.[1] The fundamental idea of the Second Epistle of Peter is this: Christians are promised to become partakers of the Divine nature by the knowledge of Christ's glory and virtue; hence they are charged *to make their godliness* [εὐσέβεια—M.] *sure by perseverance*, ch. i. 3, 4. Conformably thereto is the Introduction, which serves the purpose of wishing and recommending them to grow in the knowledge of God and in Christ, ch. i. 1–3. Why this is necessary is shown by the argument.—The above mentioned theme, ch. i. 3, 4.

DEVELOPMENT: I. They are to grow therein practically by the development of their Christian life, ch. i. 5–9.

II. Their growth in knowledge is necessary, because otherwise they would fall through stumbling, v. 10–12.

III. Such a stumbling might be occasioned to them by his impending departure (his martyr-death) and lead to their doubting the promise of Christ's advent, v. 13–19. (But prophecy is established as the word of the true prophets of God contrasted with the false prophets who shall arise, ch. i. 20—iii. 2).

IV. The coming of those who deny the advent of Christ, ch. iii. 3, 4.

V. Refutation of their denial, v. 5–13. Conclusion, with a reference to misinterpreted sayings of Paul, concerning the advent of Christ, v. 14–18.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE (on the character of Jude, see my *Life of Jesus*, II., 149, 699; *Apostolical Age*, I., p. 364.—Compare the Epistle of Jude in this work) may be regarded as the forerunner of the apocalyptic descriptions of Gnostic Antinomianism (2 Pet. ii.; Rev. ii. 6; vv. 14 15). The type of its doctrine and the symbolical mode of its expression connect it with the Epistle of James. Its more definite analogies in the Old Testament as revelations of the judgment are the books of Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah. On the Apostolicity of its Author compare our special introduction to James.

The fundamental idea of the Epistle of Jude: contending for the true faith against the false belief or unbelief of the (Gnostic) Anomists, v. 3. The introduction pursuant to this theme: a word addressed to *those who continue preserved in Christ* vv. 1, 2. The theme, v. 3. Division of the short Epistle.

I. The real character of the Anomists: turning the grace of God into wantonness, v. 4.

II. The ancient types of these Anomists and of their judgment; *a*, the people of Israel in the wilderness; *b*, the rebel-angels; *c*, the Sodomites, vv. 5–7.

III. More definite characteristics. Fanaticism unfolding on the one hand into voluptuousness, on the other, into contempt of authority, vv. 8–10. The development of their ruin, v. 11. Their pseudo-Christian and anti-Christian character, vv. 12, 13.

IV. Their coming foretold as to the fundamental trait of their character, viz., murmuring against revelation; *a*, by Enoch, the most ancient prophet (according to Jewish tradition, to which the book of Enoch also must be supposed to have been indebted); *b*, by the Apostles of Christ, v. 14–20.

V. Exhortation to proper behaviour towards them; *a*, defensive, vv. 20, 21; *b*, polemical, v. 22, 23. Conclusion. Benediction for the preservation of the readers and doxology, vv. 24, 25.

THE EPISTLES OF JOHN join with the Epistle to the Hebrews, as the last type of the developments of Pauline doctrine. They form in conjunction with his Gospel and Apocalypse the last and most completed type of New Testament doctrine. On the unity of this grand trilogy, compare my *History of the Apostolic Age*, II., p. 571.

The much misunderstood unity of the three Epistles of John, flows from the relation of the second and third Epistles to the theme and division of the first. For the theme of the first Epistle is not, as is commonly supposed, communion with God through Christ, but the mutual communion of Christians based upon that communion. The true communion of the Church based upon walking in the light, ch. i. 7. The Introduction leads to this. The end of all Apostolical preaching is to bring about Apostolic communion as a medium of communion with the Father and the Son. For historically the communion with God is made to depend on communion with

[1] I did not know at the first advancing of my hypothesis, that Bertholdt had already considered the second chapter as an interpolation.

the Apostles; but then the communion of Christians among themselves as a communion of perfect joy (the κοινωνία=ἐκκλησία) is made to depend on communion with the Lord. Hence:

I. The communion of God and Christ on which the communion of Christians is made to depend: *a*, permanent reconciliation; *b*, confession of sins; *c*, faith in the Advocate; *d*, the keeping of His commandments; *e*, that is, of His word; *f*, *i. e.* of the commandment of brotherly love; *g*, formation of this behaviour in fathers, young men and children; *h*, the rooting of this behaviour in the love of God, as contrasted with the love of the world, ch. i. 7—ii. 17.

II. The communion of Christians as contrasted with the Ebionito-Antichristian denial of Christ and hatred of the brethren, evidenced by *the abandonment of communion*, ch. ii. 18—iii. 24. The Antichristians; *a*, seceded; *b*, denial that Jesus is the Christ, the Son; *c*, exhortation to perseverance in faith; *d*, the protection of the anointing (with the Holy Ghost); *e*, the dignity of adoption [*Kindschaft*=state of being the children of God—M.]; *f*, the demonstration of adoption: righteousness, brotherly love.

III. Maintenance of purity of communion as contrasted with Gnostic spirits who deny Christ having come in the flesh, ch. iv. 1–6.

IV. The vitalizing of the communion of Christians among each other, ch. iv. 7—v. 12; *a*. The source of brotherly love: God is Love; *b*, Maintenance of this love by brotherly love, by the Holy Ghost, by the confession of Christ; *c*, the perfecting of this love in joyfulness before God; in rejoicing in the brethren as God-born; *d*, Test of true brotherly love by the love of God as evidenced by faith in the Son of God. Conclusion. Exhortation to faith; to prayer; to intercession for erring brethren; to confidence; to watchfulness against deifying the world, ch. v. 12–21.

Now since the First Epistle of John manifestly sets forth the law of the life of Christian communion, his two lesser Epistles are clearly corollaries of the first, the second (to the κυρίᾳ) warning against a lax loosing of the limits of communion, and the third (to Gaius) contending on the other hand against a fanatical narrowing of its large-hearted and wide-reaching sphere.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, being so variously connected with the Catholic Epistles and more particularly with the Epistle of James, we also add a brief notice on its construction. Its fundamental idea is: Christ, the fulfiller of the revelation of the Old Testament as the Son of God, is as such *the eternal Mediator of the real atonement-religion* [Germ. *Versöhnungs-kultus*, the real worship of the religion of atonement—M.], and therefore the eternal and heavenly *Centre* thereof, ch. i. 2, 3.

I. As such He is superior to the mediators of the Old Testament economy; *a*, to angels, even as God-Man, ch. i. 4—ii. 18; *b*, to Moses, the servant of the house, as the Son preparing the house, ch. iii. 1–19; *c*, to Joshua, the mediator of Sabbath-rest in Canaan, ch. iv. 1–13; *d*, to Aaron, the Highpriest, as a Priest forever, who has offered obedience, ch. iv. 14—v. 14; *e*, to Mosaism in its entireness, *to which the readers of the Epistle cannot return without falling away*, ch. vi.; *f*, to Abraham even, as the real Priest of God, typified by Melchizodek, ch. vii. 1–11.

II. As the priesthood of Christ is superior to the status of the Old Covenant, so is also the New Covenant with its services superior to the Old Covenant. *a*, The superiority of the new law and covenant, ch. vii. 12–22; *b*, the superiority of the new priesthood, vv. 23–28; *c*, the superiority of the new sanctuary and its services, ch. viii. 1—x. 39. (1, The new tabernacle, 2, the New Testament, 3, the new entrance of the new High-priest into the holiest of holies. The new covenant-blood and sacrifice. 4. *Warning against the new or the New Testament apostasy*).

III. Hence the New Testament faith is also the sublime completion and fulfilment of the old faith, ch. xi. 1–40. *Warning against apostasy from this faith*, ch. xii. 1–17.

IV. Hence also the new congregation on the spiritual Mount Zion, is superior to the old congregation at Mount Sinai, ch. xii. 18–24. *Warning against disobedience.* Exhortation to thank-offering; to the manifestation of this living service in brotherly love, ch. xii. 25—xiii. 7. Conclusion. The application, ch. xiii. 9. Caution against false teachers. Exhortation to bearing the reproach of Christ, to the life of prayer, to churchly disposition [*i. e.* with reference to ch. xiii. 17—M.]. Appropriate benediction and salutation, ch. xiii. 10–24.

3. LITERATURE ON THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

See the GENERAL COMMENTARIES. Those on the New Testament HEUBNER, (Vol. IV., has since been published), HEIDEGGER, *Enchiridion*, p. 617. DANZ, *Universal Dictionary*, p. 513; Supplement, p. 60. WINER, *Manual of Theol. Literature*, 1, p. 270; Supplement, p. 42. LILIENTHAL, *Bibl. Archivarius*, p. 734. REUSS, *Introduction*, p. 132. WIESINGER, *The Epistle of James* (Olshausen's Commentary, Vol. VI., part 1., p. 45).

On the CATHOLIC EPISTLES IN GENERAL OR IN PART: CLEMENT OF ALEX., DIDYMUS, Ven. BEDE, GRYNÆUS, ARETIUS, JUSTINIANUS, HORNEJUS, HERDER, *Epistles of two brothers of Jesus in our Canon, Lemgo*, 1775.

ON SEPARATE EPISTLES: SCHRÖDER, SEEMILLER, SEMLER. ROOS, MORUS, HOTTINGER, ZACHARIÆ, *Paraphrase Exposition*. Göttingen, 1776. BENGEL, *Explanatory Paraphrase of the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation of John*, Tübingen, 1781. Commentary by G. SCHLEGEL, 1783.—CARPZOV, *Epist. Cathol.*, Halle, 1790. J. L. W. SCHERER, the *Catholic Epistles* Vol. I., James, Marburg, 1799. AUGUSTI, the *Catholic Epistles*, Lemgo, 1801–1808. POTT, *Epist. Cathol.*, 2 vols., 1786–1810. GÖPFERT, the *so-called Catholic Epistles*, Lemgo, 1801–1808, GRASHOF, the *Epistles of the Holy Apostles James, Peter, John and Jude, translated and explained*, Essen, 1830. JACHMANN, *Commentary on James*, Leipzig, 1838. SCHARLING, *Jacobi et Judæ Epistolæ*, etc., Copenhagen, 1841.

TREATISES ON THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES:—STÄUDLIN, *Comment. de fontibus Epistol. Cathol.* Göttingen, 1790. STORR, *de Cathol. Epist. occasione et consilo, Tübingen*, 1789. J. D. SCHULZE, *on the Sources of the Epistles of Peter*, etc. *The literary character and value of Peter, Jude and James*, Weissenfels, 1802. F. LÜCKE *ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαί*, and *Epistolæ Canonicæ* in *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1836, p. 643–650. MEYER's Commentary (Parts XII. XIV., XV., Commentary by HUTHER); DE WETTE, *Exeget. Handbuch*, I Vol. 3; III. Vol. 1.

[Besides the *General Commentaries* of MATTHEW HENRY, SCOTT, GILL, CLARKE, WHITBY, D'OYLY AND MANT, BARNES and the *Greek Testaments* of BLOOMFIELD, ALFORD and WORDSWORTH, there are also the following: APOSTOLICAL EPISTLES: CAJETANUS, Folio, Venet., 1531. TITELMAN, F., *Elucidatio in omnes epistolas apostol.*, 8vo., Anto., 1532.—GUALTHERUS, R. *Homilæ in omnes epist. apostol.*, Folio., Tiguri, 1599.—HEMMINGIUS, *N. Comment in Omnes Epist. Apostol.*, Foiio, Lips., 1572.—ESTIUS, GUILELMUS, *In omnes Epist., item in Cathol. Comment.* Moguntiæ, 1841–45. DICKSON, D., *Expos. analyt. omnium Apostol. Epistol.*, Glasg., 1645.—PYLE, THOMAS, *A paraphrase, with notes upon the Acts, and all the Epistles*, 2 vols. 8vo., London, 1737.—MACKNIGHT, JAMES, *A new literal translation from the orig. Greek of all the Apostolical Epistles*, etc., London, 1816.

ON THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES: THEOPHYLACT, OECUMENIUS, AQUINAS, HUS, FABER, CALVIN, COCCEIUS, CRIT. SACR., CORNELIUS A LAPIDE, RICLOT, DOM LOUIS, *Paraphrase des Epîtres Canoniques*, 12vo., Metz 1727. (Much commended by CALMET). COLLET, SAMUEL, *Pract Paraphr. on the seven Catholic Epistles*, etc., Lond., 1834. BENSON, G., *The seven Catholic Epistles*. SUMNER, ABP., *Pract. Expos. of the general Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude* 8vo., Lond. 1840.—M.].

II. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

1. THE AUTHOR.

James, who describes himself as Author of this Epistle, must be either the Apostle James the Less (Mark xv. 40), or the son of Alphæus, Jacobus Alphæi (Matth. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13), or also "the Lord's brother" (Gal. i. 19; ch. ii. 9), who is altogether identical with Jacobus Alphæi (Acts i. 13; xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18).

This definite hypothesis does not follow solely from the Introduction of this Epistle, in which he calls himself "a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." But it does follow from it, that James claimed to possess a prominent position in the Church, and felt conscious of being known to the whole Jewish-Christian Church as James, the servant of God and of Jesus Christ in an exclusive sense, which rendered it impossible to confound him with any other James.

But that the tradition of the Church ascribed to him (with a preponderance of testimony) Apostolical authority follows from the reception of his Epistle into the Canon, although it was enumerated among the Antilegomena; indeed it is matter of inquiry, whether during the third century it was not by confounding data and opinions first included for awhile among the Antilegomena.

It is settled, however, that James the Elder, the son of Zebedee, cannot have been the author of this Epistle, because he suffered martyrdom as early as A. D. 44 (Acts xii. 1, 2), while the internal allusions and statements of this Epistle belong to a much later period. The subscription in the Peschito and that in an old Latin translation ascribe without any reason the authorship to him, and Luther took him for the pretended author.

The question of the authorship of our Epistle would thus be settled, had not an old error diffused the opinion current in ancient tradition and modern theology, that it is necessary to distinguish the Apostle Jacobus Alphæi from the Lord's brothers. *It is the old Ebionite apocryphal legend of the Lord's brothers.*

Adhering to the simple statements of the New Testament all doubt concerning the identity of James with "the Lord's brother" must vanish; although we do not at once see why James the son of Alphæus should be called the Lord's brother.

For James, the son of Alphæus, passes at once from the lists of the Apostles, given in the Gospels (Matth. x. 2; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14), into the list of the Apostles given in Acts (ch. i. 13). Here he appears as yet as James the son of Alphæus, by the side of his prominent name-sake, the son of Zebedee, who is therefore called simply James. But immediately after the death of this prominent James (Acts xii. 2) there is mentioned another James, who bears that name without all further qualification (Acts xii. 47); and the assumption is highly improbable that James, the son of Alphæus, should in so short a time, have vanished from the stage past all tracing, without being thought worthy of having even his death noticed by Luke, the historian, and that there should suddenly have sprung up some non-apostolical James, who actually occupied a prominent position among the Apostles. We are thus forced to maintain that if after the death of James the son of Zebedee, who was simply called James, there arose forthwith another James who went simply by that name, that James must have been the son of Alphæus. And thus he is mentioned all through Acts, ever the same and ever in the same position of a mediator of the new Christian faith and the historical national consciousness of his people (ch. xv. 13; xxi. 18). But while the last meeting of Paul the Apostle, and this James of the Acts, who is called James without any further addition to his name, occurred about 59–60, A. D., it is to be noticed, that Paul made mention of James, as the Lord's brother (Gal. i. 19; ii. 9) several years before that time (about A. D. 56–57); so also the appellation "the Lord's brother," simply, or "James" simply (1 Cor. ix. 5; ch. xv. 7 about A. D. 58). Here, again we have to call attention to the circumstance that Paul, in the first chapter of Galatians, conjoins the same James, whom in the second chapter he describes as one of the pillars among the Apostles, with the rest of the Apostles, as the Lord's brother.

In the first place, then, we must hold fast the hypothesis that James the son of Alphæus, and the Lord's brother, are identical. The question now comes up, what is the relation of this supposition to the most ancient tradition of the Church? The oldest tradition is represented by Hegesippus and Clement of Alexandria. Hegesippus, according to Eusebius, iv. 23, reports as follows: "James, the brother of the Lord received the government of the Church conjointly with the Apostles, who from the time of the Lord until our own was surnamed the Just by all; for many were called James, but this one was consecrated from his mother's womb." Then follows an account of his holiness, the character of a pious Nazarite and a faithful Christian martyr. He undertook the government of the Church with the Apostles, that is, he was not the exclusive bishop, but the coöperation (in the office) was reserved to the Apostles as such. As bishop in the Apostolical sense, according to which every overseer of the Church was subject to the joint Apostolate of the Church, he was distinguished from the Apostles although he was at the same time an Apostle,[1] just as Peter was distinguished as spokesman from the other Apostles, although

[1] Huther (p. 4, Note 3) thinks that the prominent position of James at Jerusalem could not have been owing to his

he belonged to their number, Acts v. 29 (ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι). If we here press the letter in the sense of a distinction of the son of Alphæus from the brother of the Lord, Hegesippus in another passage (Euseb, III., 22) on the descent of James declares himself in favour of the identity. He says that Simeon the son of Cleophas succeeded James the Just as bishop, this one again being a descendant of the same uncle of the Lord (θείου αὐτοῦ referred to the next following ὁ κύριος), and that all gave him this preference, as being the second relative of the Lord (ἀνεψιός).[1] Cleophas, or what amounts to the same thing, Alphæus (cf. Bretchneider's Lexicon) was consequently our Lord's uncle, James and Simeon (the same as Simon) his sons, James and Simon brothers, both the sons of Alphæus, both cousins of the Lord, but the former, as appears from what has gone before, revered by the surname "the brother of the Lord." Still more important is the testimony of Clement of Alexandria (*Euseb.* II., 1): "The Lord imparted the gift of knowledge (the gnosis) to James the Just, to John and Peter after His resurrection. These delivered it to the rest of the Apostles." He then adds expressly, "there were, however, two Jameses; one called the Just, who was thrown from a battlement of the temple and beaten to death with a fuller's club, and another, who was beheaded." To this must be added the testimony of Origen in his *Commentary on Matthew*, ch. xvii. But the testimony of the Gospel according to the Hebrews that Christ, after His resurrection, had appeared to James the Just, the brother of the Lord must be taken in conjunction with the testimony of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 7), that "Christ was seen of James, then of *all* the Apostles." The same appearing therefore is called once an appearing to James the Apostle, and again an appearing to the brother of the Lord.

The list of the brothers of Jesus, given in the Gospels, specifies James, Simon and Judas (Matth. xiii. 55). The list in Acts also specifies James, Simon and Judas, but it distinguishes the James there introduced as the son of Alphæus, from James the son of Zebedee, the Peter there introduced, as Zelotes or the Canaanite from Simon Peter, and the Jude there introduced, as Lebbæus or Thaddæus from Judas Iscariot.[2] In the Apostolical Epistles we find after the death of the elder James, the name of a James who is an Apostle and also a brother of the Lord (Gal. ii.; Gal. 1)[3], who is also a brother of Jude, and to whom we are indebted for an Apostolical Epistle.

The most ancient tradition (that of Hegesippus) informs us therefore that James the brother of the Lord, was the brother of Simon, and that both were the sons of Cleophas=Alphæus. But from Clement we actually learn that there existed no other James of any importance than James the Elder and James the Just, who was one of the most distinguished Apostles (so distinguished that Clement, indeed, erroneously confounds him with James the Elder). Lastly concerning Jude, Hegesippus reports likewise a Jude who was *called* the brother of our Lord, according to the flesh (Euseb. III., 19, 20). Eusebius after his uncritical manner, or as an erring exegete, turns the phrase "*he was called* a brother of the Lord" into, "he *was* a brother of the Lord." For in like manner he makes Simeon the son of Cleophas, whose death is reported by Hegesippus (Euseb. III., 32), the grandson of Cleophas, because he understood the phrase "Maria Cleophas" to denote "Mary the daughter of Cleophas."

This identity, which is everywhere transparent, follows also from the most striking particular evidences. Mary, the mother of James the Less or of James the son of Alphæus, is also the mother of Joses (Matth. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40; v. 47, ch. xvi. 1). This proves that four brothers of the Lord bore the same names as the four sons of Alphæus, viz.: James, Simon, Jude

---

Apostleship "which pointed rather to missionary activity than to the episcopal government of a congregation." But where was *the* Apostle of the Jews to reside, if not at Jerusalem? If Christ did charge the Apostles "Go ye into all the world," He surely did not mean to exclude the centre of Judaism.

[1] On the view of Neander, who makes Ἰάκωβον the subject of αὐτοῦ, cf. my article "*Jacobus*" in Herzog's *R. E.* p. 407, and my *Apostolical Age*, I. p. 194. Nor does the note of Huther (p. 5) affect our explanation, especially as it proposes to *leave undecided* the account of Hegesippus, that Simeon the son of Clopas was ἀνεψιός of the Lord.

[2] Huther will not admit that this Jude is a son of Alphæus, but the son of a James, because he is called Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου in Luke vi. 16 and Acts i. 13. But Jude 1 proves that a Jude might be thus designated with reference to his honoured and universally known brother. Lebbæus also is placed in juxtaposition with James in Matth. x. 3 and we must not press the circumstance that he is not expressly called his brother. In the case of this Jude it was contemplated to distinguish him as much as possible from Judas Iscariot (see Jno. xiv. 22), and this was accomplished by designating him as the brother of the well-known James.

[3] Stier's and Wieseler's proposed distinction between the James of Gal. 1 and Gal. 2 is so forced as to render all refutation unnecessary.

and Joses. On the numerous complications of both lines, see this commentary on Matth. xiii. 53–58.[1]

The opposite view, that the brothers of the Lord constitute a line of the same name to be distinguished from said Apostles is a development which through different stages must be traced back to the Jewish-Christian consciousness; treated with respect to the real point of observation, we may designate it as a view of *Ebionite-apocryphal* origin. Its first stage is the New Testament emphasis on the sons of Alphæus as being the brothers of the Lord. The Jewish-Christians gave peculiar prominence to the respective Apostles of the Jews, especially to James, particularly as contrasted with the authority of Paul. Paul admits this emphasis as to its historic value and recognizes as a climax of authority in which we have first the Apostles in general, then the Apostolical brothers of the Lord and then Peter, the Apostle (1 Cor. ix. 5). But his language in Gal. 2 shows how far he is from according to this historical authority anything like Apostolical priority. The continuance and growth of this Jewish-Christian emphasizing follows especially from the report of Hegesippus. But he still insists upon the identity of the brothers of the Lord with the sons of Alphæus, he still designates their brotherhood as an original cousinship, he still holds fast to the coördination of the Apostles.—All this was changed with the full development of Ebionitism. The first Ebionite fanatics, who brought about a decided schism, denounced the aged bishop Symon, doubtless because he opposed their heresy, as a descendant of David, consequently as a relative of Jesus, doubtless after immoderate veneration had changed into immoderate hatred (Euseb. III. 32). But the later Ebionites (according to the *Clementines*) highly exalted James as the Lord's brother even above Peter. Now since Peter was unmistakably the most distinguished member of the whole Apostolical College, the distinction of the brothers of the Lord from the like-named Apostles became inevitable. In the case of the common Ebionites was superadded the natural interest that this facilitated the view which made Jesus the actual son of Joseph, and Mary the mother of a number of children.—This spurious, apocryphal tradition imposed upon and misled the uncritical Eusebius, who was wont to huddle every thing together, who was consequently either greatly at variance with himself or uncertain in himself. As by misunderstanding Papias, in the interest of Theology against the Apocalypse (see *Apostol. Age* I., p. 215) he conjured up the phantom of a presbyter John, and made Judas Lebbæus Thadæus one of the seventy disciples (i. 12, 13), so he made also James, the brother of the Lord one of the seventy, that is: distinguished from James the Apostle (i. 12), although in every instance he takes refuge behind tradition.

This laid the foundation of the vacillations of the later fathers concerning the brother of the Lord, among whom Gregory of Nyssa and Chrysostom favoured the distinction, Epiphanius and Augustine the identity, while Jerome is undecided (see Article *Jacobus* in Herzog, p. 408). Since all these fathers depend on Eusebius, their opinion, as opposed to the original tradition in this matter, is devoid of all independent weight. In modern and most modern times the majority of theologians beginning with Luther (that the author of the Epistle "was some good, pious man") have decided for the distinction; but they are opposed by a great number of eminent theologians (see Winer, Art. *Jacobus;* Wiesinger, *The Epistle of James*, Introd. p. 4 and others).

The only question, however, relates to the merit of the arguments advanced in support of the two opposing views. But first of all must be settled the question how it was possible that the sons of Alphæus and of a Mary different from the mother of Jesus, could be or become the brothers of the Lord. According to Hegesippus (Euseb. III., 11) Alphæus or Clopas the father of Symeon the second bishop of Jerusalem, was the brother of Joseph and consequently Symeon the cousin of Jesus, by origin. But Mary the wife of this Alphæus is commonly and erroneously considered to have been the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus. For Wieseler (in *Studien und Kritiken* 1840, Vol. III., p. 648) has shown that Jno. xix. 25 ought to be rendered: "But there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and the sister of His mother (Salome; after the manner

[1] Huther who characterized this presentation of the remarkable complications of said names as exaggerated (p. 4) supports his statement mainly by the assertion that it is erroneous to maintain the identity of James the Just and James the son of Alphæus. But this is just what follows from the report of Hegesippus (Euseb. IV., 22). δεύτερον evidently belongs to the immediately preceding ἀνεψιόν and sustains the exposition that "Simeon the son of Cleophas our Lord's uncle, next was appointed bishop."

of John only to indicate personal relations without specifying names), Mary the wife of Clopas and Mary Magdalene." Hence the sons of Alphæus were at the most cousins of the Lord in the legal sense through their father Alphæus and Joseph the foster-father of Jesus, while the sons of Zebedee were at all events His cousins in a stricter sense, as the sons of Salome, the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus. Hence the reference to a *wider* sense of the term *brother* as denoting a relative or cousin (ἀνεψιός) is altogether insufficient to account for the constant appellation of James as the brother of the Lord. "But in this place arises the most simple hythoesis, supported by the custom of the Jews everywhere (see John xix. 26, 27). Cleophas was dead, Joseph the foster-father of Jesus was his brother, (Hegesippus in *Euseb.* xi. 3); he now became also the foster-father of the sons of his brother Cleophas and thenceforth the family of Joseph and the family of Alphæus-Cleophas, the other Mary, therefore, and her sons James and Joses, Simon and Jude, with several daughters formed one household (Matth. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3). Now after the decease of Joseph also, the oldest brothers of Jesus, who most probably were older than Jesus, especially James, gradually became the heads of this household and this circumstance would account for the disposition of these brothers even at a later period, to assume some kind of guardianship over Jesus (Mark iii. 31; Jno. vii. 3.—See my article *Jacobus* in *Herzog's* Lexicon)."—The sons of Alphæus were then according to Jewish law the brothers of Jesus.[1] Schneckenburger on the false hypothesis of Mary Cleophas having been the sister of the mother of Jesus conceived that upon the early decease of Joseph, Mary the mother of Jesus went to live with her sister the wife of Alphæus.—

We now purpose giving (with reference to the Article *Jacobus* in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædia* already quoted repeatedly) a brief account of the reasons and counter-reasons of the distinction between James the son of Alphæus and James the brother of the Lord.

Reasons: 1. James the son of Alphæus, being only the cousin of Jesus, could not be called the brother of the Lord. This difficulty is set aside by the above discussion of the subject.

2. The most ancient tradition of the Church does not make mention of James, the brother of the Lord, as of an Apostle. We have seen that the most ancient tradition affirms the opposite.

3. In the title of the Epistle of James the author simply calls himself the servant of Christ. But Paul also describes himself by the same title in the Epistle to the Philippians, John in the two lesser Epistles calls himself presbyter, and James had reasons of humility, wisdom and faith for calling himself the servant of Christ especially as he might well notice the abuse to which the appellation "brother of the Lord" had given rise.

4. Jno. vii. 5, we read that "the brethren of Jesus did not believe in Him," at a time when James the son of Alphæus had been received already among the Apostles. But John doubtless refers to the same unbelief or want of resigned obedience of faith[2] according to which his mother also did not believe in him, Mark iii. 31, or Peter, Matth. xvi. 23 and Thomas, Jno. xx. 25.

5. The passage Acts i. 13, 14, besides enumerating the Apostles, mentions the brothers of Jesus. The primary reference may be to Joses and his sisters; but just as Mary, who certainly belonged to the women, is introduced besides the women by the special designation of Mary the mother of Jesus, so also the Apostolical brothers of Jesus, besides having been included in the list of the Apostles, may be introduced by the special designation of the brothers of Jesus.

6. 1 Cor. ix. 5, introduces the brothers of the Lord alongside of the Apostles. To be sure; but Peter also is mentioned in particular according to the climax: a, Apostles in general, b, the brothers of the Lord as distinguished Apostles in the estimate of the Jewish-Christian opponents of Paul, c, Peter as the most distinguished Apostle.

---

[1] Huther says p. 7 that this hypothesis is devoid of all solid reason but he substantiates his assertion only by the statement that tradition is ignorant of the early death of Clopas and the adoption of his children by Joseph. *History* knows that the sons of Alphæus and Mary the mother of Jesus formed one household in which the former wielded some authority. Huther (p. 8) thinks it more probable that Mary and the brothers of Jesus believed (according to Mark iii. 21, 31), Jesus to be beside Himself, than to have had recourse to a pretext in order to extricate Him from supposed imminent danger. Mary is to have believed the report that Jesus was out of His mind!! We use here for once two marks of attention against the one of Huther, who, after the manner of Meyer expects it to produce a sensation and for the rest remind our readers of Luther's well-known flight to the Wartburg.

[2] "Altogether arbitrary." says Huther, although the matter may be elucidated by the analogous cases in the conduct of Mary, of Peter, of the sons of Zebedee and of Thomas.

Counter-reasons. 1. It is hardly conceivable that Luke (Acts xii. 2) should suffer James the son of Alphæus to vanish from the stage without all further mention and to let some other James, until then not an Apostle, forthwith (Acts xii. 17) enter the circle of the Apostles and enjoy peculiar distinction, without offering any explanation of the fact.

2. It is purely inconceivable, considering the importance attached by the Apostles to a duly authenticated call to the Apostleship (Acts i. 21, etc.), that they should have agreed to acknowledge as a man of Apostolical vocation, James a recently converted non-apostle, although he was a brother of the Lord; and especially that Paul, who was obliged so emphatically to defend his apostolicity against Judaizing Christians, should have accorded so prominent a position among the Apostles (Gal. ii.) to a non-apostle.

3. If any thing, it is still more inconceivable that the names of three real Apostles should have been extinguished without all trace by the names of three non-apostles who had acquired Apostolical authority, viz.: James, Simon, Jude.

4. Equally inconceivable is this threefold dualism of three names of equal dignity, equal descent and relationship, and of equal fraternity, that is,

a. James, Simon and Jude were Apostles. Another James, another Simon and another Jude acquired Apostolical distinction in their stead.

b. James the Apostle was the son of an Alphæus, the non-apostle James and his brothers were also the sons of an Alphæus.

c. In like manner James the Apostle and Joses were brothers, being the sons of Maria Alphæi. The non-apostles James, Simon, Jude and Joses being the sons of Alphæus probably would be also the sons of the same Mary.

5. In the passage 1 Cor. xv. 7, a distinction is drawn between the appearing of Christ to James and His appearing to all the apostles indicating that he had been mentioned before as a single Apostle.

6. The passage Gal. i. 19: "But another of the Apostles saw I not save James the Lord's brother," can only by finesse be construed to mean that James was not counted among the Apostles, as has been done by Hess and Neander, but each in a way of his own. To this must be added:

7. Moreover the coördinate authority of the same James with Peter and John Gal. ii. to which Paul offers not the least objection although he had taken the watchword "to know nobody after the flesh." We have still to superadd:

8. The above-mentioned most ancient church-tradition with its decisive testimony.

9. The demonstrability of the obscure Ebionite-apocryphal origin of the legend of the Lord's brothers taken in conjunction with the insecurity of Eusebius and the false security of the fathers who sustain their opinion by his.

10. The agreement of the characteristic traits of the brothers of the Lord according to the Gospels with the characteristic traits of the like-named Apostles with reference to the *caution* of James (Mark iii; Acts xv. xxi. 18; the Epistle of James), to the *fiery vivacity* of Judas Lebbæus Thaddæus (Jno. vii. 3; Jno. xiv. 22; the Epistle of Jude), which may also have been the characteristic trait of *Simon Zelotes* at an earlier period of his life; cf my *Life of Jesus*, p. 148; *Apost. Age* 1, p. 364. We have elsewhere repeatedly affirmed the identity of James and the brothers of the Lord with great decisiveness (*Life of Jesus; Apost. Age*, Article *Jacobus* in Herzog's *Encyclopædia*, in this Commentary on Matthew); but here it was impossible to avoid repeating a short resumé of the process and it is necessary to use every effort towards the removal of the groundless and unreasonable *Apocryphon* of false learning from the field of theology.

After what has been said we may briefly sketch the life-portrait of James. It follows from the foregoing statement that James also must have been among the brothers of Jesus, who after His first appearance at Cana in Galilee accompanied Him to Capernaum. The Evangelist designates these companions of Jesus to have consisted of His mother, His brothers and His disciples. We have seen that there was good reason for the continuance of the two categories, *His brothers and His disciples*, at a later period, because the two lines did not fully cover each other, that is, because Joses and the sisters never belonged to the circle of the Apostles. But while we assume

that the sons of Alphæus at that time were not yet disciples, their inclination to believe seems to follow from their having joined the company of Jesus.[1] Soon after, after the first festive journey, Jesus appeared at Nazareth (Luke iv. 22; Matth. xiii. 55), and on that occasion His brothers are mentioned as follows, James, Joses, Simon, Judas. Matthew according to his arrangement has assigned the respective event to a later period, probably because he connects it with a subsequent appearance of Jesus at Nazareth. Even then only the sisters, probably married, appear to reside at Nazareth (Math. xiii. 56; Mark vi. 3). Again at a somewhat later period took place the first sending of the twelve disciple-Apostles and among them we find the name of James the son of Alphæus and the names of his brothers Lebbæus Thaddæus or Judas and Simon Zelotes or the Cananite. But the surname the son of Alphæus distinguishes our James from James the son of Zebedee. The separation of the Apostles had occurred some time before the visit of Jesus to the feast of Purim in the second year of His official life. At that feast Jesus had incurred the hatred and persecution of the Jewish hierarchy by the performance of a cure on the Sabbath day; hence He soon after was put to great straits in Galilee and His mother and brothers (Mark iii. 21–35), conceived it their duty to restrain Him from His bold attitude towards His enemies and to save Him from their hand by stratagem. There is as little difficulty in supposing James the son of Alphæus to have participated in this rashness as there is difficulty in admitting the rashness of the sons of Zebedee (Luke ix. 54), of Peter (Matth. xvi. 22), and in the unbelief of Thomas. Indeed we may go even so far as to suppose that James was the chief prompter in this matter, which exhibits a sinful caution, whose purified and spiritualized counterpart we meet again in his later conduct (cf. Acts 15, and ch. xxi.). For the same reason we may suppose that in the second exhibition of rashness in the opposite direction, on the part of the brothers of Jesus, which took place in the autumn of the same year before the feast of Tabernacles (Jno. vii. 3, 4), it was not James who was prominent but his brothers, especially Judas, who although silenced did at a later period revert once more to the idea of inciting Jesus to manifest Himself to the world (ch. xiv. 22), although it is to be noticed that Jesus had again greatly raised the courage of the disciples on the mountain of transfiguration and at the foot of the same. The degree to which the family of Alphæus emulated the sons of Zebedee (Matth. xx. 20), in their sympathy with our Lord in His end at Jerusalem, is apparent from the fact that Mary the mother of James the Less and Joses was among the women that were spectators of the crucifixion. Yes, it was she only, who on the evening of the burial of Jesus in company with Mary Magdalene, sat over against His tomb (Matth. xxvii. 61); in the same manner, she and Mary Magdalene were among the first of those women who on Easter-morning hastened forth to the tomb of Jesus (Matth. xxviii. 1). Meanwhile James quietly matured into one of the much distinguished Apostles. After the martyrdom of the elder James, who seems already to have stood in a nearer relation to the government of the Church at Jerusalem, because Herod Agrippa laid hands on him first, James the Less, according to a tacit presupposition, seems to step into his place; for Peter charges those, to whom he showed himself after his deliverance from prison, to tell James and the brethren. At the Apostolic Convention at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) James is one of the most distinguished speakers; and here we perceive clearly that he deemed it his task to be the mediator of the religious liberty of the Gentile Christians and the national customs of the Jewish Christians. He stands on precisely the same platform of faith as that of Peter and Paul; what he proposes in order to pacify the Jewish Christians is not a religious but an *ethical* dogma; a measure of missionary wisdom, which accordingly meets the approbation of all the Apostles. That he did not Judaize, and indeed as an Apostle he could not judaize, is evident from the decided ground he took against judaizing demands, which was also fully accorded to him by Paul (Gal. ii.). On the other hand, in his cautious consideration for the Jews, whom in their national totatility he would gladly have saved for the Christian faith, he went to the utmost limit, as is evident from the counsel which he and his immediate associates gave to Paul on his last visit to Jerusalem (Acts xxi.). Paul was to give proof to the Jews that he did not despise the customs of the fathers by accom-

[1] According to *Huther* they went with Him from Cana to Capernaum, not because they were inclined to believe, but because they belonged to their mother. He seems to conceive them to have been young children, but Mark iii. clearly shows that such was surely not the case.

plishing the vow of a Nazarite in the temple at Jerusalem. We cannot consider this counsel in the light of an inspiration; it miscarried and actually produced the very opposite effect that had been contemplated. But Paul, who also before this entertained a high esteem for James (Gal. i. ii.), saw nothing to object to it, although he could offer the most decided resistance to every judaizing tendency, even when Peter was guilty of it. But this cautious position of James, this keeping sacred the national custom of his people enables us to understand how the judaizers might make such manifold abuse of his name (as is apparent from Gal. ii. 4, 12, and similar indications). James, then, is above all things an Apostle, a witness of Christ, everyways the equal of the other Apostles; Christianity is to him the fulfilment of the Old Testament, a new, absolute, eternal principle of religion and in this respect he, Paul and John occupy the same platform. But, in the next place, he is also the Apostle of the Jews '*par excellence;*' that is, he conceives of Christianity in its close connection with the Old Testament, as the new perfect law of spiritual life and of liberty, because on the other hand he apprehends Judaism as passing into Christianity [Germ. *werdendes Christenthum*] and feels conscious of a special call for his people. As to the form of James's ideas, it is to be noticed that he addresses Jewish Christians (for it is settled already that our Epistle can belong to only one James) to whom the mediating dialectical form would be a heterogeneous element. The purity of his Greek style indeed has been to some an enigmatical phenomenon. But it characterizes also the Apostle of holy carefulness.

Baumgarten (Acts iv. 127) has treated at large of the grandness of the ecclesiastical position of James. The following sentence however requires to be examined. "James refuses to acknowledge any other liberty than that formed within the measure of the law and in this sense he calls the law, the law of liberty."—In that sense the law has always been a law of liberty; but here the reference is rather to a liberty, developing and manifesting itself as a new law of life, and which preserves holy Jewish custom *in* Jewish-Christianity but patriarchal custom *with* (alongside of) Jewish-Christianity. "James represents the Christian dogma in the form of the Jewish Ethos [ἔθος=custom—M.]. He has removed the Old Testament law, as such, from the sphere of religion into the sphere of *national custom*. And this was the very task assigned to him, because he had to put forth the best effort of love with a view to gain the Jewish *nation* to Christianity. This effort is recorded by historical tradition." (See Herzog's *Real-Lexicon*, Art. *Jacobus*). Three reports are in perfect agreement on the characteristics of James and also with the sketch of his character found in Holy Writ. The Gospel according to the Hebrews narrates of him, that James after the death of Jesus took the vow, that from the time he had shared the last meal with Jesus he would not eat any thing until he saw Him risen from the dead; that the risen Saviour soon afterwards appeared to him and told him, "Go eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from the dead." This report sounds rather apocryphal; but its subject-matter, although not its very words, are confirmed by the statements of Hegesippus, that James was a Nazarite, and by the fact that he also recommended Paul to fulfil the vow of a Nazarite (Acts xxi). This Nazarite vow on the part of James surely does not denote a wavering faith, as Neander thinks, but rather an over-bold form of his assurance of faith. In a general way, however, the account in the Gospel of the Hebrews concerning a special appearing of Christ to James agrees with the statement of Paul 1 Cor. xv. 7. The second particular, for which we are indebted to Josephus (*Antiq.* XX. 9, 1) consists of a general notice of the martyrdom of James. He reports "that the high-priest Ananus, a Sadducee, in the interval between the departure of Festus from Palestine, A. D. 62 [Josephus speaks of his death—M.], and the arrival of Albinus, the new Procurator, caused *the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ, whose name was James and some others,*[1] whom he had accused as breakers of the law, to be stoned to the great dislike of the more moderate citizens, who therefore informed against him before Albinus." Eusebius (II. 23), superadds the words of Josephus that all the calamities of the destruction of Jerusalem did happen to the Jews to avenge James the Just who was brother of Him that is called Christ and whom the Jews had slain, notwithstanding his preëminent justice. To this we must add in the third place the detailed account of Hegesippus in Eusebius (II. 23). "With the Apostles James, the brother

[1] On the doubt concerning the genuineness of the words in Italics expressed by Clericus and others, see Huther p. 2. Note. But the several notices of Eusebius seem to sustain Josephus.

of the Lord, succeeds to the charge of the Church—that James who has been called the Just and from the time of our Lord to our own day, for there were many of the name of James. He was holy from his mother's womb (a Nazarite, one consecrated), he drank not wine or strong drink, nor did he eat animal food; a razor came not upon his head; he did not anoint himself with oil; he did not use the bath. He alone might go into the holy place (εἰς τὰ ἅγια)."—This expression is falsely interpreted as designating the holiest of holies. The expression may admit of such an interpretation, but the Jewish law forbids it. The acknowledged Nazarite might probably go with the priests into the temple proper (Acts xxi. 26).—"For he wore no woollen clothes but linen. And alone he used to go into the temple and there he was commonly found upon his knees, praying for forgiveness for the people, so that his knees grew hard-skinned like a camel's, from his constantly bending them in prayer and entreating forgiveness for the people." On account therefore of his exceeding righteousness he was called "Just" and "Oblias" (according to Stroth עֹפֶל עָם), which means in Greek "the bulwark (pillar) of the people" and "righteousness," as the prophets declare of him (in the opinion of the Jewish people). Some of the seven sects of the Hebrews inquired of him, "What is the door (doctrine) of Jesus?" And he said that this man was the Saviour, wherefore some believed that Jesus is the Christ. Now the forementioned sects did not believe in the Resurrection, nor in the coming of one (Christ, Messiah) who shall recompense every man according to his works; but all who became believers believed through James. When many therefore of the rulers believed etc. At last, reports Hegesippus, there arose a general conflict of opinions among the people and at the Passover they placed him on the gable of the Temple and bade him solemnly declare in the audience of all the people what he believed concerning Jesus, because he was the Just and would speak in conformity with his convictions. From that lofty place he then cried with a loud voice: "Why ask ye me about Jesus, the Son of Man? He sits in heaven on the right hand of great power and will come in the clouds of heaven." And many were convinced and gave glory on the testimony of James, crying, Hosannah to the Son of David. But the Scribes and Pharisees cried "Oh! oh! even the Just is gone astray," rushed up and threw him down. Below they then stoned him (symbolically, therefore, the whole act was of course a zealotical stoning and so Josephus, from his centre of observation, correctly reports the event) and slew him with a fuller's club."—This narrative affords also a full illustration of the forementioned statement of Josephus superadded by Eusebius that the wisest among the Jews agree with him in regarding the destruction of Jerusalem as the punishment of this crime. Josephus and the Jews who were of his mind seem to have had an obscure foreboding that James was the last preacher of repentance sent to the Jewish people as a nation, and that the murder of this witness of the truth was the decisive stubbornness of the people as a people, upon which the judgment had inevitably to follow. Neander and Schaff have discovered without reason much legendary matter and an Ebionite mode of thinking in the report of Hegesippus. Hegesippus was certainly a Jewish Christian but not an Ebionite. It must not be overlooked that his opinion of James momentarily commingles in his report with his opinion of the Jewish people. But this narrative is strongly authenticated in all its main features. That James was a Nazarite is supported by Acts xxi. 23 etc., and by the citation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The zeal of James in interceding for the Jewish people is reflected in every thing we know of him. Josephus also testifies to the veneration James enjoyed among the Jewish people. But most important, in the last place, is the account of that public crisis which was to determine the decision of the Jewish nation for or against faith in Christ; and the antecedents of similar analogous crises, particularly in Acts v. 13; vi. 7; xxii. 22, as well as its internal truthfulness, give decided support to this the main feature of the account of Hegesippus. The Nazarite character of James would also explain the reason why, to judge from later indications, the Essenes in particular became converts to Christianity and were more especially attached to the person of James not only as Jewish Christians but also in the direction of the Gnostic Ebionitism. The veneration with which Jewish Christians were wont to regard "the brother of the Lord," which had already before that period become extremely one-sided, would be heightened in their case and the Clementines in particular supply evidence that this veneration had actually been thus heightened,

for they exalt James above Peter and all the Apostles and make him the supreme Bishop of all Christendom. James has here been made the symbol of *judaistico-chiliastic* claims to the government of Church and the world. According to Epiphan *hæres.* XXX. § 16 there were among the glorifications of James actually ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου, descriptions of his pretended ascension. Epiphanius also notwithstanding his antagonism to the Ebionites, holds similar exaggerations (*Hæres.* XXIX. 4 and LXXVIII. 13). Probably it is only owing to Epiphanius misunderstanding Hegesippus that he states, "that James was like the highpriest permitted to enter once a year the holiest of holies because he was a Nazarite and wore the highpriest's mitre (τὸ πέταλον). This myth is not on a level with the account of Polycrates respecting John (Euseb. V. 24). Polycrates doubtless accorded the highpriest's mitre to John in a symbolico-ideal sense; which is hardly so in the case of Epiphanius. (See Herzog, Art. *Jacobus*). An ambiguous notice in Eusebius (VII. 19) states that the Church at Jerusalem in token of their veneration of James had preserved as a holy relic, his official seat.

Owing to the mythical difference between James the Just and James the Apostle the myth took further occasion to decorate particularly the end of the latter, considered separately. Nicephorus, II. 40, reports him to have first appeared as a messenger of faith in South-Western Palestine, then in Egypt; and that he was crucified at Ostracina in Lower Egypt. (For particulars see Natalis *Alex. Sæc.* I. p. 59.) On the Church legends of the supposed two Jameses cf. Stichart, *Ecclesiastical legend of the holy Apostles*, Leipzig, 1861, p. 79 etc. The chronology of Eusebius fixes the death of the real and one James in the year A. D. 63. Eusebius judiciously connects his death with Paul's appeal to Rome (II. 23). Until then the hatred of the Jews had been directed mainly against Paul whom they tried to kill by all means. But by his appeal to Rome he escaped further persecution on their part. But since James had consorted with him at Jerusalem, it was natural that the hatred of many Jews should now be turned against him, the most distinguished representative of Christianity among them. But from this it does not follow that Eusebius intended to say that James was killed as early as the time when the appeal took place; nor does it follow from Eusebius III. 11 that the death of James took place immediately before the destruction of Jerusalem. The notice of Josephus that James was killed after the departure of Festus and before the arrival of Albinus leads to about the time given in the chronology of Eusebius, for Festus was called away in A. D. 62.

"Among the Apostles James is, *par excellence*, the representative of Christian wisdom, gentleness, mediation and union; as apostolical presbyter-bishop of Jerusalem he is the representative of Jewish nationality and custom in its Christian transformation and transfiguration. As the son of Alphæus he presents a contrast to the fiery, impetuous Judas Lebbæus Thaddæus, and exhibits the character of a sage and a sufferer matured, according to his charisma, in caution by constant spiritual discipline. Thus he was the last and most engaging expression of the Gospel to the Jewish people; and after the stoning of this messenger of faith, the city and people were sealed unto judgment, which was acknowledged not only by Eusebius, but even resented by Josephus. Jerusalem rejected Christianity especially because it hated in it the union with Gentile Christians." (From the article "*Jacobus*"). On the literature of treatises on the supposed two Jameses see Winer's *Real Wörterbuch*, Art. *Jacobus*, p. 525. Also Wiesinger's *Commentary* p. 21 and the *Introduction* of Theile.

[Excurses on the Brothers of the Lord.

[The family relations of Joseph and Mary demand more than a passing or one-sided notice. This interesting, but very difficult and complicated subject involves the question: *Was Jesus the only child in the Holy Family, or were there other children, and if so, who were they?*

The New Testament answers the first part of the question in the negative, and says concerning the second that Jesus had brothers and sisters. They are mentioned with or without their names twelve times in the Gospels (Matth. xii. 46, 47; xiii. 55, 56 (ἀδελφοί and ἀδελφαί); Mark iii. 31, 32; vi. 3 (sisters also); Luke viii. 19, 20; Jno. vii. 3, 5, 10, once in Acts (i. 14), once in 1 Cor. (ix. 5) and once in Gal. (i. 19), where James of Jerusalem is called the Lord's brother.

St. Matthew (xiii. 55) gives the names of the four brothers, viz. James, Joses or *Joseph*, Simon and Judas.—St. Mark (vi. 3) calls them James, Joses or *Josetus*, Simon and Juda.

Neither the names nor the number of sisters are mentioned, but they cannot have been less than two.

It is to be noticed that in all the passages referred to they are also called *His* brothers and sisters, *i. e.* the brothers and sisters of Jesus, never His cousins (ἀνεψιοί) or kinsmen (συγγενεῖς), and that these brothers and sisters are always mentioned in connection with Mary.

These are the simple facts of the case, and in any other case, the terms used would have been received in their natural sense, the brothers and sisters would have been regarded as brothers and sisters, nothing more or less. But dogmatical prejudices and ascetic extravagances concerning the sanctity of celibacy began at a very early period to apply a non-natural interpretation to the terms brothers and sisters with reference to our Lord. At least *three* leading theories have been advanced towards the solution of this question.

I. The theory which makes the brothers and sisters of Jesus the children of Joseph by a former marriage, or the adopted children of Joseph.

II. The theory which makes them the children of Mary, the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, or the cousins-german of Jesus. As a variation of this theory, there is another which makes them His cousins both on the side of Joseph and Mary.

III. The theory according to which they were the children of Joseph and Mary, or the actual brothers and sisters of Jesus.

A condensed survey of these theories will enable us to form an idea of the difficulties connected with our subject.—

I. The hypothesis that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were the children of Joseph by a former marriage or his adopted children is founded on traditional notices drawn from the apocryphal gospels, which represent Joseph as a man of 80 years when he married Mary, the father of four sons and two daughters by his former wife Escha. The names of the children are variously given. This is the earliest tradition concerning the parentage of the brothers and sisters of the Lord, but need not detain us long, because even Jerome, the strenuous advocate of the *cousin-theory*, denounced it as "*deliramenta apocryphorum*," as "apocryphal nonsense." But notwithstanding this strong censure of Jerome, and ample margin being left to the reputed *age* of Joseph at the time of his marriage, it contains nothing intrinsically improbable. It is indeed, and we think justly, pronounced by Stier and Greswell a mere fiction devised to save the ἀειπαρθενία of Mary, and advocated on grounds of *expediency* by modern authors, but although the children of Joseph might and would be called the brothers and sisters of Jesus, the hypothesis is open to very grave objections, because it makes them the seniors of our Lord, which conflicts with their constant attendance on Mary and our Lord's being the legal heir to the throne of David, a prerogative that could only have been enjoyed by the first-born, not by the last-born; for the people clearly knew nothing of His supernatural origin and here we have to deal altogether with popular impressions.

A modification of this hypothesis is Lange's *adoption-theory*. He supposes Joseph to have had a brother Clopas or Alphæus, who married a certain Mary, not the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus. He died early and Joseph adopted his children who thus became the legal brothers and sisters of our Lord. Their mother also became an inmate of Joseph's family. It is hard to realize such a state of things, if we consider that Joseph was a poor carpenter, and that Mary the supposed mother of those children should have relinquished her maternal rights over them. The hypothesis, although very ingenious, is purely speculative, countenanced neither by exegesis nor tradition, and evidently the result of dogmatic and critical perplexity.

Lichtenstein makes Joseph and Clopas, two brothers, marry two sisters both named Mary. At the death of Clopas, Joseph took Mary, the widow of Clopas, into his family, and thus the children were doubly related to our Lord, legally on their father's side and naturally on their mother's side—and might therefore after their adoption be styled tho brothers and sisters of the Lord.

The *Levirate* hypothesis, according to which Joseph on the death of his brother Clopas, married his widow, and that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were the fruit of this marriage, belongs under this head, but needs neither discussion nor refutation.

II. We come now to the *cousin*-theory, which makes the brothers and sisters of our Lord the children of Clopas and Mary, the sister of Mary the mother of our Lord, and alleges that these children by a lax use of the words brother and sister were regarded to sustain the fraternal relation to our Lord.

This theory rests upon the following assumptions, 1. That Alphæus and Clopas are identical; 2. that Mary the mother of James, Joseph, Simon and Jude was his wife and the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus; 3. that the lax use of the term "brother" is a fact. These assumptions are open to weighty objections.

a. The identity of Alphæus and Clopas rests on the slender foundation that James the Less, one of the twelve is called the *son of* Alphæus ('Ιάκωβος ὁ τοῦ 'Αλφαίου Matth. x. 3; Mark ii. 14; iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13) and that one of the spectators of the crucifixion, called Mary (Clopa=Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ) was the mother of James the Less, because a Mary, the mother of two sons James and Joses is mentioned in Mark xv. 40; and that the Hebrew חַלְפַי and the Greek 'Αλφαῖος are supposed to be different forms of the same name. This is probable but not certain. Matthew or Levi, moreover was also a son of Alphæus, and if the ellipsis in 'Ιούδας 'Ιακώβου (Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13) is to be filled up, as is commonly done, by inserting ἀδελφός, the Apostle Jude also was a son of Alphæus. Furthermore, if this Mary was also the mother of Simeon, another Apostle, we have the extraordinary fact that *four Apostles*, claimed by the advocates of this theory as the brothers of Christ, did not believe in Him, for John expressly informs us that His brethren did not believe in Him. (John vii. 3 sqq.).

b. The assumption that Mary the mother of Jesus, and Mary the mother of James and Joses were *sisters* is founded on a solitary passage in John, which admits however of a very different and far more probable solution. It is Jno. xix. 25, which as punctuated and read by the advocates of the *cousin*-theory, enumerates the three Marys as spectators of the crucifixion. "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and His mother's sister Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene," but the more correct reading is "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother and His mother's sister (Salome, the mother of John the Evangelist), Mary the wife of Clopas and Mary Magdalene."—We know from Matthew that Salome, the mother of Zebedee's children was present at the crucifixion, and this indirect reference to his mother, accords with the usual delicacy of John.

Instances of two sisters having the same name are indeed occasionally met with, but they are far from common; considered as a question of probability, it must be decided in the negative, and this decision will be corroborated by the other arbitrary and illogical elements of this hypothesis.

Let us look at it from another point of view. The Evangelists enumerate James, Joseph (for that is the *true* reading in Matthew) Simon and Jude as the four brothers of our Lord. The advocates of the cousin-theory allege that they were his *cousins*, but were *called* his brothers. We read also of another Mary the mother of James and Joses, who is nowhere called the mother of Simon and Jude. Now because she had one son, or if you will, two sons, whose names were identical with those of the brothers of the Lord, it is inferred that she was the mother of the brothers and sisters of the Lord. But the most authentic codices and the most reliable critics pronounce *Joseph* to be the correct reading in Matthew, and this develops the extraordinary logic that because here is a mother of *two* sons one of whom has the same name as that of a son of a mother of *four* sons, THEREFORE she is the mother of the four. The acumen of Aristotle, surely, is not needed, to detect this fallacy.—Add to this that the brothers of Jesus appear uniformly in the company of Mary, the mother of Jesus, that the Hebrew אָח, the representative of the Greek ἀδελφός, is used only twice in a lax sense, and then only in the case of *nephews*, that the words ἀνεψιός, *consobrinus*, or cousin (Col. iv. 10 applied to Mark the cousin of Barnabas), υἱὸς τῆς ἀδελφῆς, sister's son (Acts xxiii. 26), and συγγενής, *kinsman* or *relative* form part of the New Testament vocabulary, that nevertheless the Evangelists use the word ἀδελφοί and

not any of the new terms, that the *brothers* did not believe in Christ before His resurrection, that therefore they could not have been *Apostles*, and that after His resurrection, even as *believers* they are expressly distinguished from the Apostles, and the inference is all but irresistible that this whole theory, from beginning to end, is involved in chaotic confusion and endless contradiction.

Much stress is laid by the advocates of this theory on the celebrated passage Gal. i. 19: "But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother." Read and construed as the verse stands in E.V. it is argued that Paul here declares to have seen at Jerusalem James, a brother of the Lord, who was an Apostle, that this must have been James of Alphæus or James the Less, because James the son of Zebedee was dead at that time, that here is a clear case of the word brother being used in the sense of cousin, and that consequently the Lord's brethren are His cousins, the children of Alphæus and Mary. The passage bears however the very opposite interpretation and some of the best Greek scholars have shown, and we think conclusively, that we ought to render "I saw none other of the Apostles (besides Peter to whom he had referred in the preceding verse) but I saw James, the Lord's brother." In other words Paul distinguishes James the Lord's brother from the twelve. Still it is only fair to add that although James was not an Apostle, yet both on account of his exemplary piety and wisdom and on account of his relation to our Lord, and as first bishop of Jerusalem, he enjoyed apostolic dignity and authority. "That such was the case is evident from various passages in Acts, in the Epistle to the Galatians, from Josephus, Hegesippus and the tradition of the Eastern Church."

III. The only remaining theory is that the brothers of Jesus were His actual brothers, that is: the children of Joseph and Mary. This view is the most natural, but beset by dogmatical difficulties. We will first state the arguments in its favour and then consider the dogmatical difficulties.

1. The language used by the Evangelists is such as to intimate that Joseph and Mary were man and wife.
2. The term 'first-born' although of technical value and importing certain privileges, may fairly be construed as implying the existence of children born subsequently, especially if it is considered that the Evangelists record events as historians after those events had become history, and that if they had intended to say that Jesus was Mary's *only-born*, it was as easy for them to select that term, which forms part of the N. T. vocabulary as the ambiguous 'first-born,' which although susceptible of a non-natural interpretation, imports generally the existence of later-born children.
3. The Evangelists mention brothers and sisters of Jesus.
4. These brothers could not have been Apostles, for they continued to disbelieve in Jesus during His life-time.
5. The hypothesis that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were the children of Joseph and Mary simplifies the domestic relations of the holy family.
6. The objection which is sometimes brought against this hypothesis that Jesus would not have commended his mother to *John*, if she had other sons to take care of her (Jno. xix. 26). "But why," asks *Andrews* if James and Judas were *Apostles* and *His* cousins, sons of her sister and long inmates of her family, and it was a question of kinship, did He not commend her to *their* care? The force of the objection remains then unbroken on the *cousin*-theory. The true reasons why our Lord confided His mother to John and not to His brothers, seem to have been the following:

a. The brothers did not believe in Him, and consequently could not sympathize with Mary in her great sorrow.

b. Between John, the most intimate friend of Jesus, who understood and appreciated Him better than all the disciples, and Mary there was the strongest bond of sympathy in their love of Jesus, and *John* was therefore most likely to uphold and comfort her with filial tenderness in her sad trials.

John, moreover, was the *cousin* of Jesus, being the son of Salome, the sister of Mary, and the *brothers of Jesus* were probably married, as the notice of Paul in 1 Cor. ix. 5, seems to imply.

The last two points we do not urge as reasons, but merely state as matters of interest.

These plain facts, drawn solely from Scripture, conflict however with the old and wide-spread view of the perpetual virginity of Mary and the feeling that it was lowering the dignity of the Saviour and that of Mary to admit the probability or even possibility of further descendants. To preclude the possibility of such an hypothesis was doubtless the ruling motive of those who gave currency to the apocryphal fiction that Joseph was eighty years old when he married Mary.

The cousin-theory which may be traced back to Papias, although made current in the Church by Jerome, clearly originated in the desire to establish the superiority of the unmarried to the married state. Gnostic principles began early to prevail in the Church and to induce the desire to separate Christ as widely as possible from other men. To obliterate, if possible, any and everything He might be supposed to have in common with other men, was believed to add to His exaltation. This exaltation would naturally pass from Him to Mary, and with the development of Mariology and Mariolatry become an article of faith. Due allowance must also be made for the feeling "that the selection of a woman and that of a virgin to be the mother of the Lord, carries with it as a necessary implication that no others could sustain the same relations with her." (J. A. Alexander). It is of course very difficult to account for the extent of this feeling, but there can be no doubt that it is not altogether free from an undervaluation of the honour and dignity conferred by our Lord on our common humanity by His Incarnation. The inspired writers of the New Testament seem to emulate each other in portraying the true humanity of Christ and in showing how He ennobled, glorified, and with reverence be it uttered, deified that nature which at the first came pure and holy from His creative Mind. It is surely an ineffably touching and consoling thought that the holy Jesus passed through every relation of human childhood and from having been a pattern of humility, modesty and forbearance to His brothers and sisters, from having borne with their impatience and want of sympathy, to evidence Himself in this respect also as our true Highpriest that He might be touched with a feeling of our infirmity." And then as to Mary, her memory will not be less dear and sacred to us, as the mother of the brothers and sisters of Jesus, than as the ever-virgin. Marriage is a divine institution and has been made doubly divine by the human mother of our Lord.—

The question has from the earliest times been variously answered; the view that Jesus had actual brothers and sisters is as old as any of the other theories and we believe, with Neander, Winer, Meyer, Stier, Alford and Farrar that it accords best with the evangelical record, and barring dogmatical prejudice or feeling, is at once the simplest, most natural and logical solution of this otherwise hopelessly confused question, which fortunately is an open one in *our* Church and most of the Reformed bodies.

Those who desire to *study* this question are referred to ANDREWS, *Life of Christ* pp. 104–116. ALFORD *Greek Testament*, Introduction to Epistle St. James, DR. SCHAFF's excellent Essay: "*Das Verhältniss des Jakobus, Bruders des Herrn, zu Jakobus Alphæi*, Berlin 1843, his annotation to Lange's *Matthew* pp. 256–266, and to my Article in the *Princeton Review* for January 1865: "*Are James the Son of Alphæus and James the Brother of the Lord identical?*"—M.].

2. GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

A. *Notices which presuppose the early existence and reception of the Epistles* in Clemens Romanus Ep. 1. ch. x.; in Pastor Hermas, *Similit.* viii. 6; in Irenæus, *adv. Hæeres*, iv. 16. *Abraham amicus Dei* (Jacob. ii. 23). Tertullian *adv. Judæos* Cap. ii.: *Abraham amicus Dei.* See on it Guerike, *Isagogik*, p. 441, and Huther p. 24.

B. *Testimonies.* The ancient Syriac Peschito contains this Epistle. Clemens Alex. knew it according to Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* VI. 14. He also alludes to James ii. 8 in *Stromat* VI.—Origen mentions the Epistle of James in Tom. 19 on John and occasionally calls it *divina Jacobi Apostoli Epistola.* Homil. 13 in Gen. etc.—Dionysius of Alexandria appeals to it in several places and Didymus of Alexandria wrote a commentary on it.—Cyril of Jerusalem and Jerome, *Cat.* 3 considered it to be genuine (Guerike p. 442).

C. *Ancient doubts of its genuineness.*—These were the natural outgrowth of the apocryphal Jewish Christian account of distinguishing James the son of Alphæus from James the brother of the Lord. It is certainly not surprising (Kern supposes it *is*) that the testimony of Hegesippus is wanting for the Epistle in Euseb. ii. 23, where he is only cited as the chronicler of the life and martyrdom of James. But Eusebius takes occasion to mention the Epistle itself in order to add the observation that it was accounted spurious, as many of the ancients had neither mentioned it nor the Epistle of Jude; but that they were publicly read in most of the Churches. The reason adduced is clearly of little weight against the genuineness of the Epistle. Origen may at first have intended to give a faint intimation of existing doubt; but this is rather doubtful (see Guerike 443, note 4). Eusebius placing the Epistle among the Antilegomena simply proves that in his time its genuineness was not universally acknowledged; he himself appears to have essentially shared those doubts, owing to his indecision in his historical view of the person in question. The doubts stated by Jerome are now only regarded as historical references; the alleged contradiction of Theodore of Mopsuestia cannot be authenticated, but even if it could, it would only be the statement of a critical view belonging to a later period.

D. *Doubts at the time of the Reformation.* Luther, in the preface to the Epistle of James A. D. 1522 says: "This Epistle of James, although rejected by the ancients (which is false) I praise and esteem good withal, because it setteth forth not any doctrine of man and drives hard the law of God (which is incorrect). But to give my opinion, yet without the prejudice of any one, I count it to be no Apostle's writing, and this is my reason. First, because contrary to St. Paul's writings and all other Scripture it puts righteousness in works (a misunderstanding; and if it were so, how could he praise it and esteem it good withal?). "Lastly he thought that the Author was some good, pious man." Yes, "some good pious man" who understood better how to warn Jewish-Christians of the insurrection of the Jews than Luther knew to warn the Evangelicals of the insurrection of the peasants.—His opinion is couched in stronger terms in the preface to the Edition of the N. T. of 1524: "On that account the Epistle of James, compared with them (the Epistles of Paul and the remaining Epistles of the N. T.) is a veritable straw-Epistle. For it lacks all evangelical character." It is striking enough that Luther held also to the opinion that the early-deceased James, the son of Zebedee was the author of this Epistle. Similar opinions rejecting the Epistle found in the Table talk (*Tisch-Reden*) proves that Luther retained this view to a later period although the respective passages were omitted in later editions of the New Testament. (See Huther p. 25). The opinion of Luther was followed by the *Magdeburg Centuriators*, Hunnius, Althammer and others; among the Reformed by Wetstein. It is known that Luther's view could not do justice to the book of Revelation and other books of Holy Writ; it was the enthusiastic prominence he gave to the doctrine of justification (the work to which he had been especially called), connected with his misapprehension of the general tendency of the Epistle and with the new born deep consciousness of evangelical liberty of thought as contrasted with exegetical tradition, that made him pronounce so embarrassed an opinion of our Epistle. In the *Dorpat Magazine for Theology and the Church* Vol. I. pt. 1. 1859, p. 152, von Oettingen reviewing Huther's Commentary on the Epistle of James says concerning the forementioned opinion of Luther: "This opinion of Luther not only has been recently adopted by the Tübingen school *utiliter* for its tendencies but it has also been repeated by the Gnesio-Lutherans, as is proved by the following hasty statement of Ströbel (in a review of Wiesinger's Commentary in *Guerike and Rudelbach's Magazine for Lutheran Theology*, 1857, II. p. 356. "No matter in what sense we take the Epistle of James, it is always in conflict with the remaining parts of Holy Writ." Very justly von Oettingen expresses his censure of that opinion in the name of the *Biblia Stroebeliana* (see in Huther p. 28). In the Roman Catholic Church doubts were uttered by Erasmus and Cajetanus.

E. *Modern doubts.* Forerunners: Faber, Bolten, Bertholdt: James wrote in Aramean, the Greek translation the work of another hand.

De Wette, *Introduction to the New Testament.* It is difficult to see why James should have written an Epistle to all the Jewish Christians in the world. Its contents are ambiguous. It lacks personality. The missed contradiction of Paul is undignified. Ch. ii. 25 seems to refer to

Hebrews xi. 31 and consequently to betray a later author. How could James write such good Greek? For counter-statements see Guerike, *Contributions*, p. 160 etc.

Schleiermacher:—*Introduction to the New Testament*, edited by Walde. He finds the opinion of Luther confirmed, the style in part ornate, in part clumsy and as to the contents of the Epistle, he finds much bombast.—

Kern:—*The character and origin of the Epistle of James*, Tübingen Magazine 1835, II. Why Hegesippus did not mention the Epistle?

Baur:—"*Paulus*," p. 677; "*Christianity of the first three centuries*, p. 96."—On the ground of the well-known Ebionite hypothesis and of the assumption that the Epistle teaches a righteousness of good works against Paul. Schwegler in the train of Baur: "*The Post-apostolic Age*, vol. I. p. 413 etc. Reasons for the alleged spuriousness: 1, The want of individuality; 2, Christian antiquity unacquainted with the Epistle and its later recognition as canonical; 3, the mild form of Ebionitism it sets forth; 4, the internal church-relations assumed in it; 5, its acquaintance with the Pauline Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel according to the Hebrews.—Quite new, but also quite untenable is here especially the discovery of Ebionitism. The very name of James, the address to the twelve tribes, the word synagogue for Church are adduced in proof of the Ebionitism of the Epistle; the rich πλούσιοι—are to denote the Gentile Christians. But in that case, ch. ii. 2 would make the congregations addressed by the author non-Ebionite, Notwithstanding the strong language used against the rich (=Gentile Christians) the Epistle is alleged to be ironical, and said to aim at effecting a compromise between Jewish and Gentile Christians. For further counter-remarks see Huther p. 301 and Reuss § 146, Note. Huther p. 31 treats also Ritschl's view of the Epistle of James (which has however been modified in the 2d edition) and mentions Rauch's attack on the integrity of the passage ch. v. 10–12, which has been repelled by Hagenbach and Schneckenburger (see Guerike p. 448).

Credner considers the Epistle genuine as the production of the brother of the Lord and denies the authorship of James the Apostle. But this point is decided by the right apprehension of the Author's person (§ 1). Moreover it is to be noticed that Schott has revived the view of Bolten etc., that the Epistle is a free translation of the Aramean original; an assumption, devoid of all foundation.

The circumstance of the Epistle not being generally known to the ancient Church at an early date may be accounted for by the following considerations:

1, It was addressed to Jewish Christians (hence it occurs already in the Peschito, because in Syria in particular there were many Jewish Christians; this circumstance is rendered prominent by Ritschl);

2, The Epistle, in its tendency, presented only few dogmatical points, whereas the ancient Church reverted especially to dogmatical points;

3, The absence of the apostolic designation in the title and similar matter. See Guerike p. 444. The chief reason lay probably in the circumstance that the consciousness of the concrete relation of the Epistle, which made it appear in its whole weight, became gradually less prominent.

[Alford: "On the whole, on any intelligible principles of canonical reception of early writings, we cannot refuse this Epistle a place in the Canon. That that place was given it from the first in some part of the Church; that in spite of many adverse circumstances, it gradually won that place in other parts; that when thoroughly considered, it is so consistent with and worthy of his character and standing whose name it bears; that it is marked off by so strong a line of distinction from the writings and Epistles which have not attained a place in the Canon; all these are considerations which, though they do not in this, any more than in other cases, amount to demonstration, yet furnish when combined a proof hardly to be resisted, that the place where we now find it in the N. T. Canon is that which it ought to have, and which God in His Providence has guided His Church to assign to it."—M.]

3. OCCASION, DESTINATION AND OBJECT OF THE EPISTLE, ITS THEOLOGICAL AND STYLISTICAL CHARACTER.

We should be obliged to treat twice of the contents of this Epistle, were we to omit to consider first the question stated at the head of this section. For in order to gain a thorough appreciation of the full import and apostolical value of this Epistle our exposition should be duly influenced by the character of James, by his relation to the Jews and to Jewish Christians, by Jewish affairs belonging to its date and by the Christian-prophetical stylistic which demanded an address to his people. To the circumstance, that the Epistle of James, in most instances, has been dissociated from all these vital considerations, is mainly to be ascribed the manifold misunderstanding of the same. The consideration of the contents according to the leading thoughts and the total impression of the Epistle, to be sure, ought to precede the investigation relating to occasion, object etc., but the exposition of its historic genesis will enable us to understand it with reference to the whole of its glorious contents, that is, then also to set forth its contents in detail.

The title v. 1 shows that the Epistle of James was addressed to Jewish Christians in the widest sense of the term, for the whole people was only one *diaspora* (dispersion) viewed as a huge whole. The same remark applies to the First Epistle of Peter with reference to the Jewish Christians of Asia Minor and also to the Epistle to the Hebrews with reference to the Jewish Christians of Palestine.—The date of the Epistle of James falls most probably (as we conclude from the developed condition of the Jewish Christian Churches) into the latest period of his life, about A. D. 62. The date of the composition of the first Epistle of Peter we fix with Thiersch (63–64) at about A. D. 64 (see my *History of the Apost. Age,* I. p. 148 and II. p. 574) not with Weiss and Fronmüller A. D. 54 or 55, because at the latter period the prolonged activity of Peter at Babylon and the multiplication of Jewish Christian Churches in Pontius are entirely out of the question. To the same period, to A. D. 62–64, belongs the Epistle to the Hebrews (see my *Apostolic Age,* I. 75; cf. this Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, where for good reasons the date given is the interval between the death of James in A. D. 61 or 63, and the beginning of the Jewish war in A. D. 67).

Said three Epistles addressed to Jewish Christians originated therefore in a period when the Jewish revolution against the supremacy of the Romans had already begun to germ and ferment in the minds of the Jewish people. The proper foundation of this revolution had already been laid by the crucifixion of Christ, but especially by the rejection of Christianity sealed with the execution of James (see my *Apost. Age,* Vol. II. p. 427). Thereby the preserving and saving element had been separated from the Jewish nationality, which henceforth, developed into perfect pharisaism, stood arrayed in deadly enmity both against the pagans and the Christians. The pagan instinct, however, returned this antagonism also in its representatives, the Roman governors and thus provocation and persecution increased on the part of the pagans, and fanatical commotions and tumults on that of the Jews. So already Felix, the proconsul, treated the Jews worse than his predecessors and the Jews in their turn resented his maltreatment by several insurrections, especially under the leadership of an Egyptian who took 30,000 men to the Mount of Olives. Similar jarrings and revolts were repeated under Festus. The Jews on the whole, restrained themselves as yet under the proconsulate of Albinus (A. D. 63–65). But the war broke out in A. D. 66 under Gessius Florus. The rupture among the Jews and Gentiles turned into open revolution first at Cæsarea; immediately afterwards at Jerusalem and the flames of the most atrocious religious war spread on all sides, to Scythopolis, Damascus, Askalon, Ptolemais, Hippo and Alexandria; everywhere the Jews were slaughtered by thousands.

It must be assumed, that the same excited, enthusiastic and fanatical disposition flashed from Jerusalem through the entire Jewish diaspora and that the hope of miraculous deliverance and the impulse of revolutionary self-help and revenge conspired every where with their animosity against the Gentiles, who in their turn were filled with equal deadly hatred.

Such was the situation. But now must be taken into account the powerful effect of such national sympathy and antipathy on the Jewish Christians. Nationally they were still Jews

and Jewish blood stirred and boiled in their veins. They were in common with the Jews attacked and tempted on the one hand, by the hatred, contempt and oppression of the pagans; and on the other by Jewish-national sympathy, by their yearning for deliverance and by their chiliastic, enthusiastic hopes. The national movements of modern and quite recent times offer appropriate illustrations of the powerful influence of such a national revolutionary current on the individual members of the respective people. That movement was consequently the great seductive alternative that lay before the Jewish Christians of that period. Standing aloof from the revolutionary movement, they were cursed and persecuted as apostates by their national brethren. We know from history how much the Christians had to suffer in this respect during the later insurrection of the Jews under Bar Cochba in the time of Hadrian. Bare sympathy on the other hand with the chimerical enthusiasm of the Jews, was entering the road to apostasy (for they exchanged the faith in Christ for the hope of a pseudo-messianic deliverance), falling into unbelief of the justice of God in the judgment that was coming on their people and severing the bond of church-fellowship with the Gentile-Christians, while they were restoring religious fellowship with Christ-murdering fanaticism.

Hence the Spirit of Christ on all sides warned them and confirmed their faith in this their situation; and the above-mentioned three Epistles are the documents of this guardian Spirit, and in this light alone can they be rightly understood. They are therefore the most appropriate sequel to the prophetical warnings, cautions and exhortations of the eschatological speech of Christ in Matth. xxiv. 16 etc.

Even if the revolutionary spirit had been less developed during the last days of James, his prophetical forebodings would sufficiently account for his hortatory Epistle (v. ch. v. 1); as in a similar manner a prophetical presentiment of the Church anticipated a dearth (Acts xi. 27); and foretold the imprisonment of Paul (Acts xxi. 10).

James had the immediate and wide-reaching vocation to confirm the Jewish Christians, without incautiously delineating the impending revolution in colours too positive. Hence he issued a circular letter to the twelve tribes in the dispersion.

This address has been variously interpreted: it is maintained that the Epistle addresses converted and unconverted Jews (Grotius, Wolf, Credner etc.), Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians as divided parties (Kern), as a closed society (de Wette and others), Jewish Christians (Neander, Guerike, Wiesinger etc.). See Wiesinger's Introduction. (The views, which assign to the Epistle a wholly particular destination, *e. g.* Noesselt: to the Christians at Antioch, see in Hertwig's Tables p. 51). Huther (p. 12) lays stress on the consideration that the Author saw only in Jewish *Christians* true Jews and that there did not then exist so sharp a separation of Judaism and Christianity.

We rather think it necessary to lay stress on the circumstance that James, according to the relations he bore to his people, and as long as that people had not set the seal to their obstinacy in the last symptoms of their apostasy (viz.: the execution of their bishops and their chiliastic revolution against the pagan authorities which involved their renunciation of Christian salvation), not only saw in the Jews catechumens of Christianity by birth, but he also saw in the Jewish Christians the true Jews. Addressing therefore the twelve tribes, he did not address the Jews in a dogmatical sense as associates of the old religious communion, but he did address the Jews as his theocratico-national brethren, the noblest part of whom had already become his brethren in the faith and all of whom were *called* to become his brethren in the faith. His primary object of course was to warn the Jewish Christians against taking part in the fanatical revolutionary spirit of the Jews, but surely his secondary purpose was to warn the Jews against being carried away by the hostility and oppression of the tyranny into revolt and the final falling away from the patience of Christ. We admit therefore the correctness of the following remark of Guerike (p. 435) "Strictly speaking the twelve tribes in the diaspora certainly denote only those living out of Palestine, but in a more general sense the term does not exclude the Jews living in Palestine and the contents of the Epistle show that the term is here used in the latter sense."

The point, therefore, on which James felt constrained to speak to all his brethren was to advert to the fact that they were exposed to a great and manifold temptation and that they needed

great perseverance in the spirit of Christ's patience. Especially he felt called upon to encourage believers (ch. i.); solemnly to threaten those who had thus far persevered in unbelief and self-righteousness (ch. v. 1); variously to instruct, warn and admonish the tempted and manifold-wavering brethren (ch. ii. etc.]. On the other hand he had to couch his warning against the chiliastico-political fanaticism of his time in terms sufficiently general and cautious in order to avoid the suspicion of being mixed up with the political issues of the question, that is, he had to treat it on purely religious grounds.

The further destination of his pastoral Epistle for all Jewish Christians, relatively including the Jews, accounts also for the careful Greek diction which is characteristic of the Epistle. It also explains the Hebrew-symbolical character of the Epistle whereby it is related to the prophetical style of the O. T. This character surely is wholly misunderstood, if the Epistle is made to yield the result that in the Churches, whom James addresses, the poor on account of their faith were oppressed by the rich, that the rich were flattered in their religious assemblies etc. As in ch. i. the twelve tribes represent the people of God in its present state of development of actual and future Christliness,* as the *ἀνὴρ δίψυχος* denotes the man who doubtingly wavers between faith and apostasy, so the poor represent the humble and those who believe through humility, but the rich denote the self-righteous and those who are unbelieving through self-righteousness. And again as in ch. ii. the synagogue describes the assembly of the congregation, and the rich man with a gold ring and a splendid garment denotes the proud, Ebionitising Jewish Christian parading his ring of the Jewish Covenant, while the poor man with a vile garment describes the Gentile Christian, so faith denotes here in the theocratic sense the Jewish theocratic rightness-of-belief (Thiersch, too strong: *Jewish orthodoxy*), while the work of faith on the other hand signifies the energy and consistency of life exhibited in faith-work, which is the evidence of living faith; the New Testament faith, consistency of life, the work *in grandi*, which is the evidence of the vitality of the O. T. faith, but especially the N. T. faith as brotherly love towards Gentile Christians (the poor brother, the poor sister). And as in ch. iii. the becoming teachers of many (*πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε*) denotes the doctrinal, propagandistic nature of the Jewish Christians and the Jews (v. Rom. ii. 17 etc.), so the fiery spark which grows into a great conflagration describes Jewish fanaticism. In ch. iv. the wars and disruptions (E. V. *fightings*) probably denote not only disputes and sectarism, but the adulterers and adulteresses describe not such persons in a literal but in the O. T. religious sense, viz.: apostates or such as are inclined that way. As ch. iv. 13, 14 contains a prophetical allusion to the sad transformation of the gain-seeking Jewish diaspora, so ch. v. foretells the great judgment impending on the rich, on self-righteous Judaism. These hints may suffice to show that the character of the Epistle answers to its end and aim. For this very reason its specifically Christian character comes out only in general outlines. The wide-reaching destination of the Epistle would hardly admit of a too definite dogmatical treatment.

That the receivers proper of the Epistle were really Christians is manifest from its fundamental Christian tone: "Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ—brethren, beloved brethren,—he begat us with the word of truth—the good (E. V. worthy) name—the killing of the Just—the nearness of the Lord—" etc. see Huther, p. 12. That on the other hand these Christians were Jewish Christians is evident from "the synagogue" ii. 2; the prominence given to monotheism ii. 19; the enumeration of Jewish formulæ of oaths v. 12 etc.; and still more from the characteristic features of Jewish improprieties which are denounced; such as pride of faith, fanaticism, conceit and such like (Wiesinger, Schaff, Thiersch, Huther).

As regards the place of writing, the Authorship of James determines also the place where he wrote the Epistle, viz. Jerusalem: "The conjecture of Schwegler that the real place of writing was not Jerusalem but Rome, is nothing but a fiction invented in favour of his hypothesis." Huther.

* The German has "in seinem jetzigen Entwicklungsstande *gewordener* und *werdender* Christlichkeit"—the literal meaning of *geworden* is "that to which it already has attained," of *werdender* "that to which it is attaining, or which it is in process of *becoming*;" actual and future seemed the best equivalents we could find without a lengthy circumlocution. Christliness is a word of my coining—I had to coin it, because the German Christlichkeit has no English equivalent or representative.—M.].

[Jerusalem was the centre of attraction to the Jews of the Diaspora; many of the Jewish Christians were doubtless in the habit of attending the feasts and thus centrally located, James had every facility of information as to the religious condition of those Jewish Christians and of oral or written intercourse with them.—The physical notices found in the Epistle support the supposition that the Epistle was written at Jerusalem. The author wrote not far from the sea, ch. i. 6; iii. 4; he lived in a land blessed with oil, wine and figs, iii. 12; he was familiar with salt and bitter springs, iii. 11, 12; the land was exposed to drought, rain was a matter of great importance to the inhabitants, vv. 17, 18; the land was burnt up quickly by a hot wind (ch. i. 11, καύσων, a name especially known in Palestine); the author names the former and the latter rain, πρώϊμος and ὄψιμος, as they were called in Palestine, ch. v. 7. See Hug. Einleitung, ed. 4, p. 438 etc. and Alford, Prol. to James III., 2, 3.—M.].

On the *date* of the Epistle opinions are much divided. Pfeiffer (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1852, Ch. I., p. 95), Schneckenburger, Theile, Neander, Thiersch, Hofmann, Schaff (and in less decided language also Huther) say that it was written before the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem, but Schmidt, Guerike and Wiesinger maintain that it was written after it. Huther gives the ollowing reason: "After that time the Pauline doctrine that man is justified not ἐξ ἔργων but ἐκ πίστεως not only had become generally known but also had so profoundly moved the mind of Christendom, that it is inconceivable that James in view of this circumstance could utter his ἐξ ἔργων etc. in perfect ignorance of it." This reason may also be reversed thus: If James wrote this Epistle earlier in an anti-Pauline sense, he would not have declared at the Apostolic Council that he was in agreement with Paul. We ought rather to distinguish between the historico-theocratic sense (Monotheism) and the specifically-Christian sense of the word faith. The chief reasons for the later date of the Epistles, namely, shortly before the death of James, are these. The spread of Christianity through the entire Jewish diaspora, and the general recognition of the authority of James by the entire-Jewish Diaspora in relation to the death of James (A.D 62–63) required to be fixed at the latest possible date.—Then we have the important consideration that a general temptation of all Jewish-Christendom to falling away from the faith arose for the first time with the first germinating beginnings of the Jewish revolution or with the more positive opposition of the hatred of the pagans to the fanaticism of the Jews. To this must be added the highly important consonancy in which our Epistle in this respect stands to the first Epistle of Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

4. THE RELATION OF OUR EPISTLE TO THE PAULINE EPISTLES, THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES, TO THE MOST HOMOGENEOUS EPISTLES VIZ. THE FIRST OF PETER AND THAT TO THE HEBREWS. ITS NEW TESTAMENT PECULIARITY.

A. JAMES AND PAUL.

The apparent contradiction between the doctrine of James (ch. ii. 24) and the doctrine of Paul (Rom. iii. 28; iv. 2) concerning justification and the question connected with it as to the relation of faith and works, did already cause Luther to be greatly staggered, and because he considered the contradiction as founded on fact, to induce him to pass the above-mentioned unfavourable opinion on the Epistle of James. In modern times theology has been much engaged with the discussion of the question whether or not James and Paul contradict each other.

The answer of this question has occasioned a group of different questions:

1. In favour of a real contradiction are Luther and his immediate followers, and recently Strœbel, Cyrillos Lucaris (see Neander's *History of the Planting* etc., *Bohn's edition*, Vol. I., p. 357), de Wette, Kern, Lutz (*Bibl. Dogmatik*, p. 170), Baur, Schwegler.

2. For a contradiction against the misinterpretation and the abuse of the Pauline doctrine on the ground of an essential agreement between Paul and James, are several ancient expositors, Augustine, Grotius (see his *Annotationes ad N. T.* II. p. 973), Gebser, p. 214, and others.

3. There is no contradiction either of Paul himself, or of the abuse of his doctrine; this view starts on the supposition that the dogmatical tropus of James, which differs from that of Paul,

* Only for the sake of noticing it, we have to add that Schwegler has removed the origin of the Epistle to a late period of the second century.

took shape sooner than the latter—so Schneckenburger, Theile, Neander, Schaff, Thiersch, Hofmann, Huther (p. 35).

4. There is no contradiction, but an antithesis and difference of dogmatical tropus. Although according to its internal relations it is the first and earliest of the N. T., it does not follow that it must also have preceded the doctrine of Paul chronologically, Schmid, Wiesinger and others.

Ad. 1. It has been supposed that the illustration of Abraham ch. ii. 21 was chosen intentionally in opposition to the application of the same illustration in Rom. iv. 1 etc.; and the illustration of Rahab, the harlot ch. ii. 25 in opposition to the application of the same illustration in Heb. xi. 31. The following circumstances, apart from the otherwise perceptible unity of spirit in the two Epistles, militate against the supposed contradiction.

a. The historically-proven assent of James to the doctrine of Paul, see Acts xv. and Gal. ii.

b. The manifest and demonstrable difference of James and Paul in the definition of the terms *πίστις, ἔργα, δικαιοῦσθαι.*

c. The actual agreement of doctrine which follows from an unprejudiced conception of the differing points of view and from the exposition of the respective passages. For while with James *πίστις* does not denote orthodoxism, because this faith may be animated by energy of life or the evidence of works (ch. i. 25), it does denote the historico-theocratical orthodoxy, which is to evidence its efficient power in consistency of life, indefatigable activity (*ἐντέλεχεια*) and energy of Christian deportment. And it is this very energy, which St. Paul calls faith, the evidence of which is its working by love.

ἔργα with James are not the dead works of the law (ch. ii. 10) but the living evidence of faith in works (ch. ii. 8). If it is alleged that James had developed a defective idea of faith, it may be alleged with equal force that Paul has developed a defective idea of works. But both would be false. With Paul living faith as the work of works excludes dead works: with James the living work-of-faith as the evidence of faith excludes dead faith. Faith without works is dogma-righteousness, *orthodoxism.* Works without the foundation of faith are work-righteousness, *ergism.*

But James as well as Paul acknowledges the *δικαιοῦν ἐκ πίστεως*; only he calls it *λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην* (see ch. ii. 23) while he understands by *δικαιοῦσθαι* Paul's *δοκιμάζεσθαι, σφραγίζεσθαι.* See Calvin *ad loc.* Huther, p. 127, and others; my *Apost. Age,* I., p. 171; the Article *Jacobus* in Herzog, p. 417.

But his point of view is not the work-righteousnes of the Jews, but the dogma-righteousness of the Jewish-Christians and Jews, a tendency which Paul also has distinguished from the tendency of ergism, as one at once Jewish-Christian and Jewish. See Neander, *Plant.,* Vol. I., p. 358., Brückner on de Wette, p. 199.

Ad. 2. It is not probable, that an abuse of the Pauline doctrine should have spread just among the Jewish-Christians, to whom James wrote. Neander, *Plant.* Vol. I. p. 359; Brückner, p. 189; Huther, p. 32.

Ad. 3. The supposition that James' dogma-tropus as related to Paul's must be taken as being undeveloped as to its forms (Neander, Schaff and others), cannot be proved.

a. Because the circular Epistle of James cannot be regarded as a complete development of his system of Christian dogma.

b. Because the use of gnomical and tropical forms in James alongside of the dialectical forms in Paul does not constitute an inferior degree of completeness, but rather the coordination of a Jewish Christian mode of teaching with the Gentile Christian mode of teaching of Paul. In like manner the historical conception of this view which assigns a very early date to the Epistle of James, has not been proved (see section 3).

Ad. 4. The view advanced under this head, as to its most important features, is sufficiently conclusive from the foregoing explanations.

On the other relations of Paul and James, relations of affinity and contrariety, which have been explained as relations of dependence and polemics, cf. Brückner on de Wette's Commentary, p. 188. [The treatise of Bp. Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica,* discusses this whole question very fully and learnedly, and the eminent author reaches the conclusion that our Epistle is not contradic-

tory, but rather supplementary to the Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans and Galatians. Compare also on the same side Barrow's Sermon on Justifying Faith, Works, Vol. IV., Serm. 5, p. 123.—M.].

B. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES AND THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES IN GENERAL.

Besides its evangelical destination, which this Epistle has in common with most of the Catholic Epistles, it shares with all of them the Jewish-Christian type of doctrine which puts dialectics in the background and gnomical and symbolico-figurative forms in the foreground (see Huther, p. 21). Its gnomical mode of statement establishes its chief affinity to the Epistles of John, its symbolical expression establishes its affinity to the Epistle of Jude, the second of Peter (ch. ii.), and besides, to the Epistle to the Hebrews which is closely connected with the Catholic Epistles.

C. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES, THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, A TRILOGY.

Above we have already pointed out the sole significance of this trilogy. They have in common the tendency of earnestly preparing the Jewish Christians in the impending outbreak of the Jewish war for the great temptation to apostasy, to which they were exposed by the hostility and oppression of the pagans and the fanaticism and revolutionary spirit of the Jews. They all aim at strengthening the Jewish-Christian people for that great temptation and at warning them of the great apostasy (see above). Here James the Apostle [?] starts with the harmony of the Jewish law itself as necessarily leading to its perfection in the Christian law of liberty, the first Epistle of Peter starts with the fulfilment of the promise of the Old Testament-kingdom in the New Testament-kingdom of inheritance, while the Epistle to the Hebrews starts with the superiority of the cultus of the New Testament to the covenant-cultus of the Old Testament. The warning of James describes the principal danger of his brethren as a *double-mindedness gravitating at once towards God and the world and the breaking out in impatience* the warning of Peter delineates it as *indecision and visionary enthusiasm* (ch. i. 13), while the warning of the Epistle to the Hebrews characterizes it as *unbelief, apostasy and rebellion.* But the spheres of their operation also are different. The first Epistle of Peter is addressed to the Jewish-Christians in Asia Minor written at Babylon, the Epistle to the Hebrews is probably addressed chiefly to the Jewish-Christians in Palestine written at Rome or in Italy, the Epistle of James is addressed to the Jewish-Christians throughout the world, written at Jerusalem.

D. THE NEW TESTAMENT PECULIARITY OF JAMES.

Besides the references of our Epistle to the Old Testament, to the book of Jesus the Son of Sirach and to the Gospels in general (ch. i. 17 to Matth. vii. 11; i. 20 to Matth. v. 22; i. 22 to Matth. vii. 21; i. 25 to Jno. xiii. 17 etc.), its references to the Sermon on the Mount also have been particularly noticed. See Brückner on de Wette, p. 187; Huther, p. 18.—James, to be sure, exhibits the glorification of the Old Testament law into the New Testament law of the Spirit, of the inner life (see Messner) in perfect analogy to the manner of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount. And this then is also his peculiar dogma-tropus. It bears as much the character of the New Testament as does the dogma-tropus of Paul and that of John, but in respect of the development of the doctrine of Christ, it occupies the first place among the dogma-tropes of the New Testament, without ignoring however the specific features of the later dogma-tropes (see my *Apost. Age*, II. p. 577). And this is the peculiarity of James. The wisdom which had been personified individually in the Logos of Truth, is also to be personified in the life of believers by *believing heart-decision* and thereby to conduct them through the fearful ruin of apostasy into which the fanatical disciples of the *double-hearted* earthly wisdom plunge headlong (ch. iii. 15) it is to evidence itself in them as steadfast patience in the joyous expectation of the advent o. Christ. To this mode of teaching answers the gnomical, New-Testament-Solomonic-calm radiance of his language, the festively sententious form of which exhibits an affinity to the language of John, although unlike the latter it is not the expression of a contemplative intuition, but that of a practical energy.

5. THE CONTENTS OF OUR EPISTLE.

The theme of the Epistle is evidently contained in the macarism ch. i. 12. "Blessed is the man that *endureth* temptation etc." Here it is noteworthy that the reference is not to man in general but to man in a sexual sense and that we read immediately afterwards "The wrath of man (ἀνδρός) worketh not the righteousness of God." We confidently assume that the reference is to a temptation to which Jewish-Christian *men* were peculiarly exposed; viz.: the thought cherished by the Jewish *men* that the righteous judgment of God on the pagans would have to be executed by an armed insurrection against them. This fundamental theme is resumed in the final theme, ch. v. 7: "Be patient (persevering in long-suffering) therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord."

The Salutation and Introduction, in the first place, correspond to the leading thought. In the Salutation the Apostle introduces himself as a *bondman* of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, intimating thereby that in virtue of this servile relation he was freed from the *bondage* under which the Jews were groaning (Jno. viii. 36). He addresses the Epistle to the twelve tribes of the dispersion because he wants to include in one category the Jews as yet unbelieving and the believing Jews, the category, that is, of theocratico-historical catechumens of Christianity, inasmuch as the final historical hardening of Israel had not yet taken place. His Salutation is couched in the Greek form χαίρειν, and apart from the example of toleration indicated by the selection of this expression, this word serves also the purpose of introducing his first idea. They should not yield to the gloomy and desponding disposition which was animating the rebellious spirits, but rejoice conformably to their Christian faith (v. 2).

The Introduction states that they should also rejoice in their *versicoloured* temptation (ποικίλοις probably more than divers, manifold), use them for their proof [δοκίμιον—M.] and not to run to ruin by wavering. The means he recommends is prayer, but prayer in faith without doubting; consequently a firm and undivided heart. Along with this the brother, who is crushed by his humble lot (surely with particular reference to his national position), is to glory in his Christian exaltation; but the Jewish-Christian, conscious of his theocratico-national riches, is to glory in his lowness. This can hardly mean his poverty in spirit or his humility before God but his historical lowness, the bondage-form of his Jewish and Christian life of faith. For the time of glory has already gone by, the grass is withered and the flower has fallen. The confident rich man (the Jew in the pride of his theocratic riches) will fade away in his occupation or schemes. Ch. i. 1-11.

The Apostle now expatiates on the theme of the Epistle viz. the exhortation to perseverance in temptation from ch. i. 13—v. 6.

I. The most important admonition, then, the Apostle names first. *Let them not in the enthusiasm of self-delusion pervert their temptation into the cause of God*, which was really done by the Jewish fanatics. Here James delineates first the contrast between the false, hypocritically decorated phantom of temptation and temptation in its true, hideous and deadly form; secondly the actual providential rule of God in its most universal character, who had made them, as Christians, the first-fruits of His creatures. Ch. i. 13–18.

II. The second admonition warns them *against fanatical zeal itself*. The wrath of *man* [sexually=ἀνδρός—M.] does not accomplish the decree of the righteousness of God. Its development must be traced to the rashness and recklessness of self-complacency. Do they wish to avoid it, let them not think that they are pure and rich but laying aside their uncleanness and overflowing riches of malice let them meekly yield themselves to the efficient operation of the implanted word. As doers of this word they will effectually guard themselves against self-deception. But they must steadily contemplate this word and enter into it, as into the perfect law of liberty. The Jew considers himself to be religious [θρῆσκος=observant of God's outward service—M.] in that his zeal of wrath gives the reins to his tongue; but their Christian true service [θρησκεία=outward service—M.] should be evidenced in their care of the orphan and widow (especially of the crushed people in its orphanage and widowhood) and their self-preservation from the pollution of the world. Ch. i. 19-27.

III. The third admonition opposes *their contempt of the pagans, especially also their contempt of Gentile-Christians.* On this account James starts with faith in Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory which admits of no respect of persons. Hence we see in the man with a gold ring on his finger, in a splendid garment, the portrait of the Jewish-Christian or the Jewish convert according to Jewish notions, in the poor man, on the other hand, in a vile garment the portrait of the Gentile-Christian or of the Gentile convert. [Lange understands by the Jewish convert and the Gentile convert those whose conversion is going on, in process of being, but not yet completed.—M.]. They ought to consider both as equals in their synagogue (assembly); yea, they should remember that those poor of this world are rich in faith, while those really rich are the proud Jews, their persecutors and the defamers of their Christian name. They are therefore to observe the royal law "Thou shalt love thy neighbour (co-religionists in a higher sense) as thyself" and to have no respect of persons. The law is a unit. Now in supposing that as true Israelites they avoid the adultery of apostasy, while with their unmerciful fanaticism they kill their Christian Gentile brother (cf. 1 Jno. iii. 15), they are transgressing the whole law. In this form the law itself becomes a law of liberty; its living totality delivers from the bondage of its single letters. In connection with this thought,—faith contrasted with works—denotes further the theocratic, Jewish-Christian orthodoxy, while the works denote the living, energetic proof of faith. The monotheism of the Jew, says James, is altogether insufficient, for the devils also participate in it. True faith must prove its vitality in the work of love, especially in brotherly love. The examples chosen in illustration are most telling. Abraham, sacrificing Isaac his son is a type of the Jewish-Christian who sacrifices his national claims; Rahab, the harlot is a type of the Gentile Christian, who came by the work-of-faith into communion with the people of God. Ch. ii.

IV. The Apostle, in the fourth place, considers it matter of great moment, to *dissuade the Jews from their fondness for fanatical teaching*, which was their characteristic both in their intercourse with the pagans in particular and with those of a different turn of mind in general (cf. Matth. xxiii. 15; Rom. ii. 19). They transgressed particularly with their irrepressibly-busy, didactic tongue, inclined to condemn and curse. The consequence of such a tendency the Apostle shows to be an earthly, sensual and devilish wisdom, born of envying and strife; with this he contrasts heavenly wisdom with the beautiful attributes of love and the blessing of peace. Ch. iii.

V. The Apostle, in the fifth place, now indicates to the Judaistically prejudiced Jewish Christians and with them to the Jews the infallible mark whereby they may perceive that their stand-point is not true; *fanatics*, he says, *live in strife and war among themselves as well as with others.* The *root* of this quarrelsomeness, he says, are lusts and worldly desires, which in their sensual life are at war with one another; its *fruit*, disappointment and the failure of all their striving, contention and even of their prayer. Ch. iv. 1–3.

VI. James now proceeds in the sixth place, to disclose the ground of those egotistical, pleasurable lusts. It is *the apostasy of the* (*spiritual adulterers and*) *adulteresses from the living God* by their worldly-mindedness; their friendship with the world (in a spiritual garb) is enmity with God. Here the portrait of Judaism appears in the foreground with increasing distinctness. It lacks the spirit which is opposed to hatred, the spirit of humility to which grace is accorded. Pursuant thereto are the exhortations which follow: Be *true* Israelites in relation to God; *true* subjects of God, *truly* praying and sacrificing to God (v. 8), *truly* purified and God-affianced (v. 8), *truly* poor and humble in the sense of the Old Testament (vv. 9, 10). Be *true* Israelites in relation to the brethren; avoid slandering, condemning and cursing! Be *true* Israelites in your dispersion-life (Diaspora-life, so *German.*—M.]! Do not yield yourselves in blind confidence to your planning, to go from city to city with a view to traffic and gain, but realize your transitoriness and dependence on God! Otherwise all your knowledge of good will turn to sin and judgment (vv. 11–17). Ch. iv. 4–17.

VII. These admonitions, the Apostle concludes, in the seventh place, by *a powerful denunciation of woe on the rich, doubtless on the Judaizing Jewish-Christians and Jews* who called themselves poor but thought themselves rich in their Jewish privileges, and here the affinity of his mode of statement with that of the prophets, becomes quite prophetical. It contains the prophecy of judgment, of a judgment which, with the destruction of Jerusalem, soon afterwards came upon

Judaism. Let them weep, *i. e.* be penitent. Their riches are corrupted etc., *i. e.* all their self-righteousness has turned to sin and disgrace. They confide in and boast of this treasure before the near day of judgment. But that which brings judgment rapidly near is the crying of the hire withheld from their labourers and reapers, the ingratitude to and the rejection of Apostles and believers, who had undertaken the harvest of Israël. The day of slaughter, which shall come on their pleasure-life, is nigh at hand, and has opened with the condemnation and murder of the Just, who now no longer arrests their running into destruction (ch. v. 1–6).

Then follows the final theme and the conclusion. Once more he addresses the brethren. Let them in long-suffering patience persevere unto the coming of the Lord (v. 7).

1. Encouragement thereto: the example of the husbandman waiting for the harvest (vv. 7, 8).
2. Conditions of that patience.
   a. They must not murmur against one another in disaffection, *i. e.* they must not nourish in their hearts the spirit of fanatical hardness and alienation. Examples: the prophets; the patience of Job; the end of the Lord (vv. 9–11).
   b. The excitement of swearing and complications by oaths they must avoid, and hallow their minds (v. 12).
   c. They must cheer their minds by prayer, praise, the help of the presiding officers of the Church, and the confession of sins (vv. 13–16).
3. Elias the type of wonder-working [effective—M.] prayer, whose first prayer effected the miracle of chastisement and his second the miracle of mercy (vv. 17, 18).
4. Conclusion. Exhortation containing a promise of blessing on the effort of reclaiming an erring brother. Every one should engage in this work, and whoever succeeds, does thereby save a soul from death and prevent the multitudinous evil of sin (vv. 19, 20). Ch. v. 9–20.

The existing tables of contents do not exhibit a perfect, organical structure of the Epistle, because the idea which animates all its separate parts, has not been laid down as the foundation of the Epistle. The construction of the Epistle has been treated *in extenso* by Pfeiffer, *On the connection of the Epistle of James,* Stud. and Krit., 1850, Part 1; in Wiesinger's division in his Commentary, p. 46; in Huther's division in his Commentary, p. 15; de Wette and Schleiermacher see neither plan nor order in the Epistle. See Brückner, p. 182 (his own exposition, p. 184); Schleiermacher, p. 421.

6. LITERATURE.

See HEIDEGGER, *Enchiridion*, I., p. 617. LILIENTHAL, *Bibl. Archivarius*, p. 784. WINER'S *Handbuch der Theol. Literatur*, I., pp. 268 and 271. *Supplement*, p. 42. DANZ, *Universal-Wœrterbuch*, p. 421. *Supplement*, p. 51. DE WETTE, *Introd.* 6th ed. p. 362. *Wiesinger's* Commentary, p. 45.—See General Works on the Bible. (Among the most recent works on the Bible is the Critical and Practical Commentary on the New Testament, by C. W. NAST, Cincinnati and Bremen, 1860);—also Commentaries on the *Catholic Epistles*.

Particular exegetical works.

ROMAN CATHOLIC: LORINUS, 1622; PRICÆUS, 1646.

LUTHERAN: WINKELMANN, ALTHAMER, BROCHMANN, LAURENTIUS etc

REFORMED: ZWINGLI, CALVIN, COCCEIUS and others.

MODERN: BENSON, SEMLER, BAUMGARTEN, HERDER, (*Briefe Zweener Briefe Jesu in unserm Kanon*), STORR, MORUS, HENSLER, HOTTINGER, POTT, SCHULTHESS, GEBSER (Berlin, 1828), SCHNECKENBURGER (1832), THEILE (1833), KERN (1838), J. J. CELLERIER (*Etude et commentaire sur l'Epitre de St. Jaques*, Genève, 1850), A. NEANDER, *Pract. Exposition, edited by Schneider* (1850), WIESINGER (Vol. VI. Sect. 1 of Olshausen's Commentary), HUTHER (Sect. 15 of MEYER'S Comment., 2d ed., 1863), BRÜCKNER'S edition of DE WETTE'S Commentary, Vol. III., Part. 1, 3d ed., 1865.

DUTCH WORKS: *De Brief van Jac., bearbeid door J.* CLARISSE, Amsterdam, 1802; M. STUART, *Amsterdam*, 1806; *Proeve eener Verklaring etc. door* G. VAN KOSTEN, Amsterdam 1821; JACOBUS etc. VAN FRIESEMA, Utr., 1842; G. VAN LEEUWEN, 1855; VINKE, 1861; *Dis-*

sertatio de Jacobi Epistolæ cum Syracidæ libro etc. convenientia, Gröningen, 1860; Recently appeared: H. BOUMANN, *Comm. perpet. in Jacobi Epistolam,* Utrecht, 1865.

FOR THE PARTICULAR TREATMENT OF THE EPISTLE see HEISEN, FLACHS, FABER. WINER, I. p. 272; DANZ, p. 421 etc.; *Supplement,* p. 51. WIESINGER, p. 46. HERTWIG, *Tabellen,* p. 51.—We must also mention, *The Apocryphal Protevangelium of James,* edited by SUCKOW (Breslau, 1841).

FOR DOGMATICAL TREATMENT consult the works on Biblical or New Testament Theology in general. See the list in HAGENBACH'S *Encyclopædia,* 6th ed. p. 201.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTLES: LUTTERBECK, die *Neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe,* 1852; MESSNER, die *Lehre der Apostel und Neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller,* 1856; *History of the Apostolic Age,* NEANDER, SCHAFF, LANGE.—RITSCHL, *Origin of the Old-Catholic Church;*—SCHAFF, das *Verhältniss des Jacobus, Bruders des Herrn, zu dem Jacobus Alphæi, Berlin,* 1842.

FOR SPECIAL PRACTICAL TREATMENT see BALTHASAR KERNER, *Jakobsstab oder Erklärung der Epistel Jacobi in* 60 *Predigten,* Ulm, 1639. HARTMANN CREIDIUS, *Jakob's Schatz, oder* 91 *Predigten über die Epistel Jacobi,* Frankfurt, 1694; DANIEL GRIEBNER, *Erklärung etc.* in 79 Predigten, Leipzig, 1720. GOLTZIUS, *de allgemene Sendbrief des Apostels Jacobus verklaart en toegeeygent, Amsterdam,* 1698; Similarly JANSSONIUS, Grœningen, 1742.—K. BRAUNE, *die Sieben Katholischen Briefe.—Die Briefe des Jakobus und Judas,* Grimma, 1847; JAKOBI, *der Brief des Jakobus, ausgelegt in* 19 *Predigten,* Berlin, 1835; STIER, *der Brief des Jakobus in* 32 *Betrachtungen ausgelegt,* Barmen, 1845; DRÆSEKE, *Predigten über den Brief Jakobi,* 1851; VIEDEBANDT, *der Brief Jakobi in Bibelstunden,* Berlin, Schulze, 1859; *Jakobus, der Zeuge vom lebendigen Glauben. Eine Reihenfolge von Predigten über den ganzen Brief Jakobi, von G. Porubszky,* evang. Pfarrer in Wien, Wien, 1861.

[*English Commentaries on James.*

TURNBULL, RICHARD, *Exposition on the Canonical Epistle of St. James* in 28 lectures, 4vo., Lond., 1606; MAYER, JOHN, *Praxis Theologica, or the Epistle of the Apostle James resolved, expounded and preached upon, by way of doctrine and use,* 4vo., Lond., 1629; MANTON, THOM., D. D., *A Practical Commentary: or an Exposition with Notes on the Epistle of James,* 4vo., Lond., 1653. Repr. imp. 8vo., Lond, 1840; 8vo, Lond., 1842.

See also STANLEY, *Essays and Sermons on the Apostolic Age,* Lond., 1852; the *General Commentaries,* those *on the Apostolical and Catholic Epistles.*—M.]

COMMENTARY.

THE EPISTLE GENERAL OF JAMES.[1]

I. INTRODUCTION.

THE SALUTATION OF THE SERVANT OF GOD AND OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST TO THE TWELVE TRIBES IN THE DISPERSION. REFERENCE TO THE VARIEGATED TEMPTATIONS TO WHICH THEY ARE EXPOSED, AND TO THE JOYFUL DESIGN OF THE SAME: THEIR CONSUMMATION.

CHAPTER. I. 1–11.

JAMES, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which
2 are scattered abroad,[2] greeting.[3] My brethren, count[4] it all joy when ye fall into
3 divers temptations.[5] Knowing *this*, that the trying[6] of your faith[7] worketh patience.[8]
4 But let patience[9] have *her* perfect work,[10] that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting
5 nothing.[11] If any of you lack wisdom,[12] let him ask of God that giveth to all *men*
6 liberally,[13] and upbraideth[14] not; and it shall be given him.[15] But let him ask in faith,
nothing wavering:[16] for he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the
7 wind and tossed.[17a] For[17b] let not that man think that he shall receive anything of
8 the Lord. A doubleminded man[18] *is* unstable in all his ways[19]. Let the brother of low
9 degree[20] rejoice[21] in that he is exalted.[22] But the rich,[23] in that he is made low[24]: be-
10 cause as the[25] flower of the grass he shall pass away. For the sun is no sooner risen[26]
11 with a burning heat[27], but it withereth the grass, and the flower thereof falleth, and
the grace of the fashion of it perisheth: so also shall the rich man fade away in his
ways.[28] [29]

[TITLE. [1] Eusebius ends his account of James the Just thus: τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ κατὰ Ἰάκωβον οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται. *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23. A. C. Sin. omit the title.—M.]

Verse 1. [[2] ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ. *In the dispersion.*—M.]

[[3] χαίρειν. Lange "*Freudengruss,*" *Freude zum Gruss*=Salutation of joy, joy the burden of his salutation; the English "greeting" is sometimes used in the same sense; so de Wette, van Ess etc.—M.]

Verse 2. [[4] The Codex Colbertinus has ἡγεῖσθε. ποικίλοις, literally, versicoloured.—M.]

[[5] The whole verse in Lange's version, "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into divers (variegated) temptations."—M.]

Verse 3. [[6] γινώσκοντες=since ye know. δοκίμιον=proof.—M.]

[7] The omission of τῆς πίστεως according to Cod. B. has been dropped on good grounds by Tischendorf, according to the decided majority of MSS. A. C. G. etc. [It is inserted in A. B. C. K. L. Cod. Colb. Cod. Sin. Vulg. Syr. Copt. Aeth. Arm. etc.—M].

[[8] ὑπομονήν=endurance. Lange's version. "Since ye know that the proof of your faith worketh endurance."—M.]

Verse 4. [[9] ὑπομονή=endurance.—M.]

[[10] ἔργον τέλειον=a perfect work.—M.]

[[11] Lange's version: "But let endurance have a perfect work (*the perfect operation of Christliness*) that ye may be perfect and entire people (*Christians*), in nothing deficient (*verkuemmert*, stunted).—M.]

Verse 5. [[12] λείπεται σοφίας=falls short of wisdom.—M.]

[[13] ἁπλῶς=*a*, liberally, *b*, sincerely.—M.]

[[14] μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος=upbraideth not, *i. e.* who gives without exprobration.—M.]

[[15] Lange's version: "But if any of you is deficient in wisdom, let him ask it from the God who giveth to all men (*also to the pagans*) sincerely (*without reservation and delusion*) and upbraideth not with it (*turns it not into the disgrace of the recipients, according to the notion of work-righteousness*), and it shall be given to him.—M.]

Verse 6. [[16] μηδὲν διακρινόμενος=nothing doubting, not in the least (Lange) doubting.—M.]

[[17a] Lange's version: "But let him ask in faith, not in the least (*faltering*) doubting, for he that doubteth is like a wave of the sea, agitated by the wind and tossed hither and thither."—M.]

Verse 7. [[17b] Lange renders γάρ=also, but we prefer "*for* let that man etc."—M.]

Verse 8. [[18] [19] Lange's version: "A double-minded (*faltering*) man: a seditious (*excited*) disturber of peace in all his ways." But this rendering is too fanciful; we prefer therefore the strictly grammatical rendering: "A two-minded man, unstable in all his ways," taking the verse in apposition with v. 7.—M.]

Verse 9. [[20] ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ ταπεινὸς—the brother who is low.—M.]

[[21] καυχάσθω—glory.—M.]

[[22] ἐν τῷ ὕψει αὐτοῦ—in his exaltation. "But let the brother who is low glory in his exaltation."—M.]

Verse 10. [[23] ὁ πλούσιος—the rich man.—M.]

[[24] *Lange* understands a second "glory," makes the passage ironical, and renders "but the rich in his humiliation."—M.]

[[25] ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου—as *a* flower of the grass.—M.]

Verse 11. [26] The Aorist with its narrative force should be retained.—M.]

[[27] καύσων may mean the dry parching East wind, *Kadim*, but "*the burning heat*" of E. V. is very felicitous.—M.]

[28] πορείαις. A. and several lesser MSS. read πορίαις, an orthographical blunder, according to Schneckenburger, because there is no noun πορία with a fixed meaning. [πορείαις is stronger than *ways*; it denotes the eager pursuit of some business or pleasure.—M.]

[[29] Render the whole verse, "For no sooner rose the sun with the burning heat (wind) and dried up the grass and the flower thereof fell away and the beauty of its appearance perished; thus also shall the rich man wither in his ways" (journeyings something like Lange's "*Glücksfahrten*").—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. Introduction. Analysis. The address and salutation; v. 1.—Reference to temptation as a proof of endurance tending to joy: vv. 2–4.—The means of endurance, wisdom; hence deficiency in wisdom to be met by the prayer of undoubting faith; vv. 5, 6.—Caution against instability; vv. 6, 7.—Particular advice to the lowly and to the rich (in their own opinion); vv. 8–10.—The fate of the rich; v. 11.

Ver. 1. *Address and Salutation.* **James,** (on James, see Introduction above) **servant of God,** applied in the widest sense to Christians in general (1 Pet. ii. 16; Eph. vi. 6), denotes in the narrower sense, in the official use of the word, apostolical men (Phil. i. 1); but here the word in its fullest weight signifies not only the head of the church at Jerusalem, but also the Apostle whose special work lay among the Jewish Christian and the Jewish Dispersion (of which Jerusalem was the centre). Rom. i. 1; Tit. i. 1. [Oecumenius: *ὑπὲρ πᾶν δὲ κοσμικὸν ἀξίωμα οἱ τοῦ κυρίου ἀπόστολοι τὸ δοῦλοι εἶναι χριστοῦ καλλωπιζόμενοι, τοῦτο γνώρισμα ἑαυτῶν βούλονται ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ λέγοντες, καὶ ἐπιστέλλοντες καὶ διδάσκοντες.*—M.].

Of God and of the Lord.—*Of God* not the attribute of *Jesus Christ*, as some expositors have rendered, but God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ represented as wielding *one* dominion (cf. Jno. xvii. 3); thereby James also wisely takes together the Old Testament and the New. The Apostolical and Christian office is *one* service; however not service rendered to man but service rendered to God and Jesus Christ with undivided consciousness, obedience and operation. [*Oec.* "*θεοῦ μὲν, τοῦ πατρός· κυρίου δὲ, τοῦ υἱοῦ.*" Bengel: "*videri potuisset, si Jesum sæpe appellaret, id ex ambitione facere, cum esset frater Domini. Atque eo minus novit Christum secundum carnem.*" It is certainly remarkable that James mentions Christ only here and in ch. ii. 1, while in his speeches (Acts xv. and xxi.) he does not name Him at all.—M.]

To the twelve tribes in the dispersion.—That is, in their Christian calling, and in being called to Christ. To Jewish Christians primarily (so Laurentius, Hottinger, Schneckenburger, Neander and others), but, secondarily also to the Jews, as far as their adoption of Christianity had not yet been given up (*sofern sie noch nicht aufgegeben sind als werdende Christen*). See Introduction. As yet all were treated as the theocratico-ideal unity of the people of Israel called to (the reception of) the faith. Of course they are distinguished from the Gentile Christians (against Huther; see Wiesinger).

The twelve tribes (*τὸ δωδεκάφυλον* Acts xxvi. 7) Matt. xix. 38; Rev. vii. 4–8, etc. *The dispersion*, see Deut. xxx. 8; Nehem. i. 9; Ps. clxvii. 2; Jno. vii. 35, etc.

Greeting.—*χαίρειν*, the Greek form of salutation (*χαίρειν* sc. *λέγει* 1 Macc. x. 18; 2 Macc. ix. 19); used also in the Apostolical decree Acts xv. 23 (to which Huther, following Kern, rightly calls attention). The Hebrew שָׁלוֹם Is. xlviii. 22 etc. Cf. the forms of salutation used by the other Apostles; as here, they always correspond with the fundamental ideas of the several Epistles. James desires to preserve to his brethren the true joy and to become instrumental in their securing it. Hence *χαίρειν* of v. 1 relates to *χαρά* v. 2, which we seek to express in the translation, "Salutation of joy (*Freudegruss*)." [See above in Appar. Crit. v. 1.—M.].

Ver. 4. *Reference to the temptation and its design.* **All joy.**—*πᾶσα χαρά*, not as some of the older expositors render "the highest joy," but all joy, joy throughout (*ὅλως* Carpzov., Huther; entire joy) unless indeed the joy, as an all-sided one, is to correspond with the *ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς* ["all sorts of joy," "all conceivable joy," Alford; "*rem revera omnique ex parte lætam*," Theile.—M.]. But this *χαρά* is not mere *gaudendi materia* (Huther): rather, they are to convert the objective substance of joy into subjective riches of joy. *ἡγήσασθε* is therefore emphatic. [The repetition at the beginning of a verse or sentence, of the last word in the one preceding, called by grammarians *duadiplosis* is characteristic of the style of James; *e. g.* *χαίρειν, χαράν* v. 1 and following; *ὑπομονήν*, v. 8; *λειπόμενοι*, v. 4; *διακρινόμενος*, v. 6; compare also v. 18, 19, 21, 22, 26.—M.].

My brethren.—Primarily used to denote community of faith, but here also community of theocratic nationality (see ch. i. 16, 19; ii. 5; iv. 11; v. 7, 9, 19). [Wordsworth remarks that "this address is very suitable in an Epistle like the present, characterized by the language of stern rebuke; inspired like the reproof of St. Stephen, by the Spirit of *Love*. James, '*the Lord's brother*,' having the Spirit of the Lord, addresses even them as '*brothers*.'"—M.].

When ye fall into divers temptations.—These *πειρασμοί* are the chief motive of the Epistle. And certainly they are not only in a general sense the *θλίψεις* which an unbelieving

world prepares for believers (Luke viii. 13; Matth. xiii. 21 (Huther); nor are they parallel to 1 Pet. i. 6. Still less are they in essential antithesis to *πειράζεσθαι* v. 13 (as Wiesinger thinks), the antithesis is at the most that of objective incitement and its corresponding subjective irritability. It is a very definite, concrete idea, the elements of which may be gathered in part from the circumstances of the time (see Introduction), and in part from the Epistle itself. The Jewish Christians were then tempted, on the one hand by the hatred of the pagans, on the other by the national fanaticism of the Jews (an alternate *odium generis humani*), and their ever-rising chiliastic desire of rebellion; they were tempted to participate in the antipathy to the pagans and to transfer it to the Gentile-Christians, to sympathize with the visionary Jewish national sentiment and thus to be again surprised by the old legal service. They were tempted to Ebionitism, which was already germinating (ch. ii), and beyond it to zealotry (ch. iii), to insurrection, (ch. iv.), and to apostasy (ch. v.). The temptation came therefore from every side and took the most variegated shapes of alluring and threatening, while their hereditary Judaistic lust presented a counter-impulse (v. 13.). Thus the one great *πειρασμός* resolved itself into the *πειρασμοὶ ποικίλοι*. Now since the adjective *ποικίλος* denotes not only the diverse, but primarily the variegated, it probably contains an allusion to the manifold-dazzling glitter of colours in which the Jewish-Christian and Jewish temptations presented themselves and whereby they might even appear in the guise of Divine revelations and prophetical warnings urging them to be zealous for the honour of God. Into the midst of such temptations they had fallen; on all hands they were surrounded by them (on *περιπίπτειν* consult the Lexica and Huther). [*περιπίπτειν* to fall into the midst of anything, so as to be wholly surrounded by it. Luke x. 30; Acts xxvii. 41. So *ὅστις ἂν τοιαύταις ξυμφοραῖς περιπέσῃ* Plato, Legg. 9, 877. c; *μεγάλοις ἀτυχήμασιν ὑπ' Αἰτωλῶν, καὶ μεγάλαις σύμφοραῖς περιπεσόντες* Polyb. p. 402, l. 5; *πανικῷ περιπεσόντες*, *Ib.* p. 670, l. 6; *λῃσταῖς περιέπεσε* Diog. Laert. 4, 50; *κακοῖς*, 2 Macc. x. 4, etc.—M.]. The design of every affliction of believers to turn by proof (*δοκιμή*) into spiritual joy (Acts iv. 23; Rom. v. 3, etc.) was consequently in an eminent degree peculiar to this great temptation. But this temptation did doubtless bring many an inconstant Jewish-Christian to ruin before the Jewish war, as did that under Bar Cochba.

VER. 3. **Since ye know that the proof of your faith worketh endurance.**—The Participle *γινώσκοντες* explains *ἡγήσασθε* and indicates by way of encouragement the manner how they might turn the heart-grief of the proof into joy (hence neither "and know" (Luther), nor "for you know" Pott). Τὸ *δοκίμιον* (found only here and 1 Pet. i. 7) may mean the medium of proof (the proper signification of *δοκιμεῖον*, which occurs as a different reading of this passage, also as opposed to *δόκιμον*), but also *proof* (*δοκιμή*) as the result of the test. Huther following Oecumenius insists upon the latter sense, Wiesinger with Semler, Theile and others, the former. And rightly so, although in 1 Pet. i. 7 the word signifies proof; for this *δοκίμιον* is designed to effect the endurance consequent upon *δοκιμή*. Wiesinger rightly cites Rom. v. 3, 4, where *θλίψις* effects *ὑπομονή*, etc. Huther says that then we ought to have *τοῦτο τὸ δοκίμιον*. But the temptation and the proof are not purely identical. The tempting element of the proof emanates from the evil one, while the proving element of the proof comes from God. Temptation is proof under the aggravating coöperation of evil incitement to evil. This settles also the objection that temptations may result in failure (of proof); for temptation as a test ever contemplates proof on condition of good behaviour. It explains also, how in the concrete manner of the Scriptures proof may be described as temptation (but with reference to existing difficulties in the proof, Gen. xxii.), and temptation as proof. On *κατεργάζεσθαι*, to work, effect, see Rom. v. 3 and other passages; *ὑπομονή* manifestly denotes here *endurance.*—Baumgarten, Theile, Wiesinger, Huther: The *μένειν ὑπό* standing one's ground in temptation. Schneckenburger remarks that if *ὑπό* be emphasized we get the idea of *patientia ac tolerantia malorum*, if *μένειν*, that of *constantia, firmitas, perseverantia.*

VER. 4. **But let endurance have a perfect work.**—Wiesinger: The emphasis is on *τέλειον*. The majority of commentators understand the perfect work as the perfecting of *ὑπομονή* itself. So Huther, Wiesinger: the proof of *ὑπομονή* (cf. 1 Thess. i. 3). Huther: *ὑπομονή* is not only passive but also active. This active *ὑπομονή* is not only to persevere unto the end (Luther: Let patience abide firm unto the end: similarly Calvin, Jerome and many others); *ὑπομονή* is to be deficient in nothing, neither in joy (Bengel) nor in any essential point; especially, wisdom, confidence, etc.—But James evidently contemplates not only inward demeanour but also and chiefly the outward exhibition of the same, which he deplored to see manifoldly omitted. Hence that interpretation is right, which distinguishes the perfect work, viz., the accomplishing of endurance, as the proof of endurance from endurance itself. So Erasmus, de Wette and others; but these commentators err in limiting this outward proof of endurance to something general, viz.: the exhibition of morality, etc. (see Huther). But James in his Epistle looks at a definite object. The *ἔργον τέλειον* by which the Jewish Christians were to verify their endurance consisted according to ch. ii. in the unreserved acknowledgment of their Gentile Christian brethren, and according to ch. iii., iv., v. in their open rupture with judaistic faith-pride and fanaticism. Yes, James cherished the hope of gaining the Jewish Christians and along with them even the Jews themselves, to a greater or less extent, for this perfect work of submitting to the practical results of the Christian life. But if the more general sense is preferred, we have the meaning that Christian endurance must evidence itself in the full carrying out of the practical consequences of the Christian faith. An *ἔργον τέλειον* of the *ὑπομονή* in our day would consist in the thorough acknowledgment of Christian humanism and the thorough renunciation of the spirit of sectarianism and fanaticism. Ἐχέτω is decidedly emphatic. To this endurance must hold, this it must receive,

acquire and this it must have to show. It is therefore at once=κρατείτω (Schulthess) and παρεχέτω (Pott).

That ye may be perfect and entire;—ἵνα decidedly expresses the word [used in the telic sense.—M.], and is explained by ch. ii. 22. Τέλειοι and ὁλόκληροι are not altogether synonymous (Huther), although the LXX. use both for תָּמִים. The former expression denotes perfection in the sense of completed development or vitality, the latter perfection in its completed manifestation. [Alford defines ὁλόκληρος as "that in which every part is present in its place," and cites Plato, *Tim.*, p. 44, c. and *Corp. Inscrip.* 853, 26.—M.]. But it denotes here specifically: If you want to become entire Jews and close the entire Jewish development, you must become entire Christians; but if you want to sustain the character of entire Christians you cannot dispense with the mark of perfect fraternization with the Christians, also with Gentile-Christians, and that of being opposed to the world, and also to the judaistic world. For the τέλειος is one who has reached his τέλος, the ὁλόκληρος one, *cui totum est, quod sorte obtigit* (*Wahl=nulla parte mancus*). The Jew was by origin a symbolic κλῆρος; as a Christian he was to become a real κλῆρος and thus ὁλόκληρος. The primary reference here is manifestly neither to moral perfection in general (Huther), nor to perfection hereafter, but to the rudimental [German: *principiell*] perfection of the faith of Christians as Christians; but the expression of James involves also the rule of absolute Christian perfection.

In nothing deficient;—λείπεσθαι means primarily to stay behind, to be inferior to another, but also to be wanting, deficient in a thing (v. 5). The latter sense is advocated by Theile, de Wette, Wiesinger, Huther with reference to v. 5 and 1 Cor. i. 7, the former by Storr, Augusti and others, whose view we consider correct notwithstanding the modified sense of the word in v. 5. For the opposite of having reached the end, or of being τέλειος is just the having stayed behind. The decay consequent upon quiescence and retrogression, the very characteristics of Ebionitism developed at a later period, and of Nazarite-Christianity, is the primary idea which corresponds with the connection of the whole Epistle. The Jewish people itself became most emphatically the λειπόμενοι of the world's history. James with a prophet's eye foresaw all this growing (*werdend*) decay. It springs indeed from a guilty deficiency in spiritual things or at least from a deficiency that might have been avoided, a point to which James refers immediately after. The sequel moreover shows that he sees in a perfect outward proof of life the full expression of character.

VV. 5, 6. *Wisdom a condition of endurance; prayer for wisdom in undoubting faith.*

But if any of you;—εἰ δὲ points hypothetically, and with reference to individuals, to a manifold probable or rather perceptible deficiency in general. Deficiency of wisdom has the form of the Judaistic and Ebionite element.

Deficient in wisdom.—Σοφίας without the Article acknowledges in a forbearing manner this lack of wisdom, supposing the deficiency to exist only in part. Oecumenius defines wisdom as τὸ αἴτιον τοῦ τελείου ἔργου, Huther as the insight of the problem of life as a whole as well as in its particular phases, which incites us to work. The reference here is not only to the Proverbs of Solomon, the Wisdom of Solomon and Jesus the Son of Sirach. The New Testament stadium of theocratical insight was objectively wisdom manifested in person (Matth. xi. 19), and therefore subjectively the right perception of the signs of the time and the christological fulfilment of the theocracy in the Church as well as in the faith of individuals.* The distinct relation of this want of wisdom to the temptations (Calvin) cannot be denied with Huther, although, wisdom, to be sure, must not be identified with endurance. As it is a fundamental condition of the same, so it is also one of the chief modes of its exhibition according to ch. iii. 17.

Let him ask from the God.—See Matth. xx. 20; Acts iii. 2; 1 Jno. v. 15. The further definition shows how important it is that real prayer must be free from the admixture of any conception which obscures the holiness and goodness of God. The Judaizer did also pray, but his conception of the Deity was a Jewish God, partial, legal and measuring His blessings according to merit. The position of the words τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ (Cod. A. τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ διδόντος) gives prominence to the idea that God is a giving God (Huther). See v. 17. Wiesinger: "*Who is known to give.*" The sense is: a giving comprehending every thing that is good, hence no object is indicated (Gebser and al).

To all.—Huther with Calvin and others supply τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν; but God's giving in the most general sense may not be measured by man's asking, although He is wont according to the measure of asking and beyond asking to give good gifts and even the Holy Spirit. [Any and every qualification of πᾶσιν reflects on the graciousness of the Giver.—M.].

Sincerely.—ἁπλῶς occurs only here in the New Testament. Huther [and Alford—M.] renders *simply* and sees in it an exclusive reference to the gift (nothing else is added to it with reference to Wisd. of Sol. xvi. 27), but the reference is not to the quality of the gift, but to the mode of giving; on this account the definition *candide, sincere* (Kerne, Theile and others), is preferable. Sincere (*pure*) giving is opposed to calculated giving which according to the view of the law, is at once suspicious and half compulsory. It refers indirectly to the source of *benignitas* (Bede and al.) and also to the liberality of giving (*affluenter*, Erasmus and al.) [Wordsworth explains: "who giveth ἁπλῶς, liberally, that is, *sinu laxo*, expanding the lap of his bounty and pouring forth its contents into your bosom. Cf. 2. Cor. viii. 2; ix. 11, and the use of the word ἁπλοῦν, *dilatare*, by the LXX. in Is. xxxiii. 23; and therefore the word ἁπλῶς is rendered *affluenter* here by the *Vulgate*, and *copiously* by the Syriac version."—M.].

* The Jews indeed had already before that time been deficient in the right comprehension of the *Solomonic* doctrine of wisdom, that is, of the universalism of the Old Testament, and for this very reason they had misunderstood and misinterpreted the *Davidic* Messianism from a particularistic point of view; just as Evangelical theology for the same reason has fallen short of its task in consequence of not sufficiently appreciating Christian humanism.

And upbraideth not with it.—Negative explanation of the preceding or of that which is consequent upon God's sincere giving. Wiesinger also explains μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος with Luther: "and upbraideth none with it" with reference to Sir. xli. 28: μετὰ τὸ δοῦναι μὴ ὀνείδιζε; ch. xx. 15; xviii. 17 (see Huther's note from Cicero). Huther disputes this exposition; Semler and al. interpret ὀνειδίζειν: *qualemcunque reprehensionem.* But then James would utter an untenable sentiment, because God notwithstanding those who ask, in various ways covers men with confusion. The expression also would be too brief in that sense; it is only intelligible if we take it with what goes before as one idea. But the exposition "to put those who ask to shame with a refusal" (Morus, Augusti and al.), is certainly unfounded; although it is less far-fetched than that of Huther; he who afterwards upbraids with his gifts is equally disposed to be hard beforehand and according to circumstances to send away the asker (without claims). "The side-look on the rich, v. 10; ch. v. 9," also, which Huther and Wiesinger detect here, cannot be sustained because it has first of all to be determined whom James means by the rich. The conception of a θεοῦ ὀνειδίζοντος would certainly agree with the religious views of said rich and then also indirectly with their behaviour.

And it (wisdom) **shall be given to him.**—There is not sufficient reason for taking δοθήσεται (with Huther and Wiesinger) impersonally: it will be given to him. See Matth. vii. 7–11; Luke xi. 13; 1 Kings iii. 9–12.

Ver. 6. **But let him ask in faith.**—James having objectively defined real prayer as the worship of the true God of revelation, now also defines it subjectively as prayer in faith. See ch. v. 15; Sir. vii. 10; Jno. xvi. 23. It certainly follows (according to Wiesinger) from the appended negative definition that πίστις here designates first of all undivided confiding, full and firm heart-trust. Such trust is only possible as a looking up to the God of free grace according to revelation; Huther therefore rejects without reason the exposition of Calvin: "*fides est quæ, dei promissionibus freta, nos impetrandi, quod petimus, certos reddit,*" as one which lacks sufficient intimations; even the still closer definition of some of the older expositors, "πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ" would seem to be included *implicite.* That is, while Wiesinger rightly observes that πίστις both with James and Paul denotes the mind's moral attitude to God, yet with James this very attitude presupposes a looking up to "the giving God" according to revelation. Hence the μηδὲν διακρινόμενος excludes at once subjective wavering and doubting the certainties of evangelical salvation, because the attempt of fixing the heart outside of the sphere of revelation (in the case of Christians outside of the name of Jesus) would be pure fanaticism. A similar conjoining of "faith and not doubting" also in an objective sense, occurs in Rom. iv. 20; cf. ch. xiv. 23; Matth. xxi. 21; Mark xi. 24. James' conception of faith as given here is consequently his full conception of faith; it is only in such an energy of praying and doing that faith is to him vital, but without it dead. Διακρίνεσθαι=being at discord with oneself, being divided in oneself, and hence doubting must be still further defined as inward false discriminating, judging and deciding, and in this root it is joined with false discriminating and judging, ch. ii. 5. The hard and austere mind on the one hand produces a hard and austere conception of God, and on the other a hard and austere deportment. Huther: "While πίστις is 'yes,' and ἀπιστία 'no,' διακρίνεσθαι is the union of yes and no, yet so that the preponderance lies with 'no.'" That is, where διακρίνεσθαι has become habitual, a governing trait of character; this is the force of the Participles. But Huther (after Calvin) also mentions the possibility of doubting alongside of honest, yet weak faith (see Note p. 48).

Caution against wavering. vv. 6, 7.

Ver. 6. **For he that doubteth is like a wave of the sea.**—Ἔοικε occurs only here and v. 24 in the New Testament. Huther sees in the γάρ of v. 7 the repetition of the γάρ in v. 6. That is, he thinks that James gives only one reason, not two and that the figurative description of him that doubteth v. 6, is only intended to bring out a clearer exhibition of the fickle mental constitution of the doubter. But "this apparently helpless disunion" assumes another form if we take v. 6 not only as a colouring but as a declaration that the doubter falls under foreign, anti-divine influences. The sea, according to the Old Testament, is the figure of the constrained (*unfrei*) life of nations, floating hither and thither in pathological sympathies (Ps. xlvi. 93; Dan. vii. 3; Is. lvii. 20; Rev. xiii. 1). James was doubtless conscious of this theocratic influence at a time, when "the waves of the sea" already began to roar. The symbolical figure of the wind (Eph. iv. 14; cf. ch. ii. 2) however, must be put in the background, because it is only expressed in verbs. But even here we can hardly fail to recognize an allusion to a restless spiritual commotion (*Geistesleben*) tossing the sea of nations, especially because ἀνεμίζεσθαι is an ἅπαξ λεγ., not found elsewhere (in classical Greek we have ἀνεμοῦσθαι, to be moved by the wind), and ῥιπίζεσθαι also occurs only here in the New Testament. On the different derivations of the word, see Huther, Note 2, p. 48; viz.: from ῥιπίς, a bellows or fan, or from ῥιπή, rush (of the wind) or storm. The latter derivation seems to lie nearest. These expressions are therefore not altogether synonymous (Huther). Bengel makes the former to denote motion from without and the latter motion from within. But both, the wind and the storm come from without; the inner element is here expressed by the sea-nature of the wave. According to Theile, the former indicates the cause, the latter the effect. But the two denote two different relations of degree: the sea in waves, the sea in billows; the breeze, the storm, the excitement of spirits, the rebellious commotion (*vide bellum Jud.*). From these considerations it seems to follow that the first γάρ has a more limited signification; it pronounces the διακρινόμενος incompetent to pray aright, because he is governed by the evil influences of the world. The second γάρ, on the other hand, bears in a wider sense upon that man's faithless relation to God. We cannot indeed conveniently render γάρ twice by *for* and repeat it therefore *intensiter* by '*also.*' Calvin makes it=ergo, Huther=namely,

that is to say (*nämlich*), Pott, a particle of transition. The lively figure is charged with propheti-co-symbolical matter.

Ver. 7. Also let not that man think [or as I should prefer to render "*Nor* let that man think." Μὴ γάρ as an elliptic phrase denotes absolute denial and an Imper. or Optat. verb is then always supplied; here the context, on any interpretation that may be adopted, involves absolute denial and the *nor* has intensive force; the meaning is "let not that man *by any means* think" or "let that man *by no means* think."—M.]. The second γάρ has particular reference to the doubter's deficiency of faith in God, which is involved in his worldly dependence. Sure, he seeks to supply that deficiency of faith by superstitious or fanatical delusions, but he deceives himself with these delusions. He must become conscious of the nothingness of these delusions before matters can mend with him. The severe handling of false praying is a very ancient characteristic of exhortations to repentance according to Is. i. 15; Luke xviii. 11, this passage and the Reformation.

That man, the one who doubts and has fallen into human weakness. [Alford sees in these words a certain slight expression of contempt.—M.].

That he shall receive any thing.—He receives *nothing;* see ch. iv. 3 where another reason is specified why he does not receive any thing. [The reference is to the things for which he prays; there are many things, temporal blessings, which he does receive.—M.].

From the Lord.—The reference is of course to God, as in v. 12; ch. iv. 10, etc., but there is a reason for the use of κύριος instead of θεός; James means Jehovah, the living covenant-God, who has now fully revealed himself in Christ. For details, see Wiesinger. [Alford quotes Hofmann, who remarks that where the Father is not expressly distinguished from the Son by the context, the Godhead in its unity is to be understood by ὁ θεός; and the same may be said of ὁ κύριος.—M.].

Ver. 8. A two-minded man.—The connection of this sentence with that which precedes it, is variously explained. The expositions of Pott: "*væ homini inconstanti*," and of Baumgarten who wants to join δίψυχος with λήμψεται may be passed over. Winer, Wiesinger and Huther [also Wordsworth—M.] take it in apposition with the former verse and as explanatory of the figure v. 6, and render "he, a two-minded man." But the explanation of a figure and especially of one so thoroughly self-explanatory would not suit the style of our Epistle. Although the necessity of the Article before ἀνήρ (Schneckenburger), if the latter exposition is given, is unfounded, the exposition itself runs into a feeble tautology. Hence we agree with Luther and many expositors in taking ἀνὴρ δίψυχος as the subject and ἀκατάστατος as the predicate and the omission of the copula (is) as elevating the sententious weight of the proposition. Huther says that this would make the thought too abrupt. But in the masculine gender it is this formal abruptness which elevates the sentence, while in point of matter the connection is perfect. The doubter is delineated first as to how he stands to the world (a wave), then as to how he stands to God (a visionist, a man of conceits), and lastly as to how he stands to and by himself. And here it is noteworthy that James speaks of man in the masculine gender, probably not only on account of his proverbial character, but because the dangers against which James cautions his readers, are more especially dangers which threaten the Jewish male-world. The δίψυχος is not the same as the διακρινόμενος (so Luther and al.). According to Huther this word "characterizes the inward being of the doubter." To be sure, the inward being, not however as the ground of doubting (Huther, Kern, Wiesinger), but as the result of doubting. For two-mindedness is forthwith mentioned as the ground in relation to the manner how the doubter proceeds. Two-mindedness indeed lies already germ-like in doubt itself, but it is doubtfulness which develops wavering and irresoluteness, wherein man has, as it were, two souls, the one touched by God, the other occupied by the world. He is false in both directions, false to God and false to the world by his double reservation, just as he is false to himself by the reservation of his egotism over against his piety and *vice versa.* But this makes him not forthwith a consummate liar and hypocrite; "he has not only, as it were, two souls in conflict with each other" (Huther), but as yet his enthusiasm glows *psychically* now for God and now for the world in two changing forms of the psychical life. The word δίψυχος is admirably formed after the analogy of δίγλωσσος and similar words; it appears to occur nowhere prior to this Epistle (see also ch. iv. 8), but besides the analogies just mentioned, it has its type in the Hebrew בְּלֵב וָלֵב (see also Jesus Sir. I, 28), and has been adopted by Clemens Rom. and other church authors (see Huther p. 51). [Alford proposes to make the whole sentence predicate and all to apply to ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. On the whole, however, we give the preference (with Wiesinger, Huther and Wordsworth) to the certainly most grammatical construction of taking ἀνὴρ δίψυχος in opposition with v. 6; not as an explanation but as an *expansion* of the figure in v. 6. This construction is by no means in conflict with the abrupt and predicative style of James, for the transition from the figure of the wave of the sea to the two-minded man is certainly bold, if not abrupt, there is indeed a transition from a physical to a psychical illustration; the word δίψυχος itself, used here for the first time in Greek literature, by its novelty would arrest attention and thus in the language of Lange, "elevate the sententious weight of the proposition."—M.].

An (excited) seditious disturber of peace.—The ordinary rendering '*unstable*' [E. V.] or *inconstant* (Luther and al.) does justice neither to the original nor to the connection. For firstly, the expression is already half settled by what precedes it as well as by the words "in all his ways;" for although the latter phrase may bear a good sense, it seems to be used here in a bad sense (Sir. II, 13 ἐπιβαίνει ἐπὶ δύο τρίβους). Secondly, the expression, as the representative of

סער (Is. liv. 11, LXX.), is too feeble in point of degree. And although, lastly, it may passively denote one driven about by the storm as well as actively a storming seditionary, ch. iii. 16 (ἀκαταστασία) recommends here the use of the active signification. The wavering man, indeed, is exciting and seditious because he is ruffled and driven by the storm (of public excitement). The wave of the sea, related passively to the winds, strikes actively against "the rock."

Particular advice to the lowly [in station—M.] *and particular advice to the rich.* vv. 9, 10.

VER. 9. **But let the brother, who is low, glory in his exaltation.**—Δὲ indicates a contrast of proper behaviour with what has just been described (Theile), [i. e. with διψυχία—M.]. It directs the brother to turn the particular temptations to wavering into instruments of constancy. Commentators are divided with regard to ἀδελφός. De Wette and Wiesinger apply the term both to the more remote πλούσιος and to the nearer ταπεινός. Then ταπεινός must not be taken spiritually according to Matth. xi. 29, but like πλούσιος with regard to outward circumstances, while the exaltation in which the lowly is to glory, would denote his heavenly dignity. But Huther, representing the opposite view, remarks that that exposition conflicts with the connection, which forbids such a distinction of Christians into poor and rich; that the reference is rather to the πειρασμοί; that a Christian, moreover, as a rich man would hardly have required so urgent a reminder of the transitory nature of things temporal. But three things are here overlooked. 1. That the πειρασμοί affect the rich in a higher degree than they do the poor; 2. That the Apostle, as we have seen in the Introduction, treats both of Jewish Christians (among whom were already rich men) and of Jews. Moreover he addresses, at the very beginning of the Epistle, the twelve tribes as his brethren. 3. The contrast between the *poor* and the rich had as yet not become prominent, but a contrast of those *low in station* [E. V. brethren of low degree—M.], and the rich. But that the *low in station* and the *poor* are, as brethren, nearer to James than the rich, becomes increasingly apparent as the Epistle runs on, especially in ch. v. Primarily, the lowly and the rich are described as brothers, for James indicates also to the rich a means of deliverance. There is still a third view, represented by Morus and Theile, which comprises both ideas: those who are outwardly poor and persecuted for righteousness' sake, Matth. v. 19; 1 Pet. iii. 14. Huther contests this union (p. 52), but afterwards reaches about the same conclusion. We have first to remember, that the brother of low station is not identical with the poor in ch. ii. Glancing at the characteristics of that time, we find that it designates the Jewish Christian and the Jew absolutely in their low, oppressed theocratic condition as contrasted with the heathen world and the seculiar power; and still more particularly the theocrat, inasmuch as he deeply feels this condition. He is to glory in the dignity of his heavenly and royally-glorious vocation, *i. e.* to derive from it consolation and joy and to strengthen himself with it. But the rich, *i. e.* again the Jew and the Jewish Christian, inasmuch as he sees the hopeless situation of the Jewish people in a very different and brilliant light, inasmuch as he is not only rich in the consciousness of his Jewish prerogatives, but also rich in the chiliastic and visionary expectation of the Messianic or pseudo-Messianic restoration of his Jewish theocracy,—he is exhorted to glory in his humiliation, that is, to become reconciled with Christian or pious humility to all his theocratical humiliation, the full development of which in all its fearful magnitude is as yet impending (v. 11), in order that he may find in this Divine judgment turned into deliverance, the source of rejoicing and exaltation and of real glorying.

And here a general explanation must suffice for our passing on to the general import of the double antithesis: the low-in-station and the rich; the poor and the rich. For we hold the opinion that, after the type of the Old Testament and the Gospels, these expressions are throughout prophetico-symbolical, and that the common literal acceptation of this antithesis has unspeakably flattened the Epistle, weakened its purport and obscured its interpretation. Is it possible to suppose that in the time of James, in all the Jewish Christian congregations among all the twelve tribes the rich were in the habit of slighting the poor and that the unbelieving Jews were everywhere the rich? And that James was so reliably informed on that point, as to feel constrained to call all the twelve tribes to account for it? Such conduct, I should think, could not be generally charged on the Jews proper. The rich among the Jews, as a rule have at all times exhibited much sympathy with and regard for their poor. And this very regard is supposed to have been wanting in such fearful generality in the Apostolic age, at a time where even in Gentile-Christian congregations collections were made for their Jewish Christian brethren! Nor was this the only point on which James felt bound to reprimand, but it is still further supposed that he had to denounce the sexton-rudeness of assigning good seats to the rich and of allowing the poor either to stand or to sit on the bare floor, which rudeness had become prevalent throughout all the twelve tribes! If James, "the good, pious man" had only received a little more credit [for capacity—M.], *i. e.* the Apostolical spirit united with prophetico-symbolical style, doubtless more would have been found in his Epistle.

The brother must therefore be taken in a general sense, like v. 2. The low (in station) is the Jewish Christian or the Jew who as such (not primarily as a private individual) felt his theocratic humiliation; this intimates, of course, that he was the more humble just as a being pinched in private affairs might also further such consciousness; this is quite analogous to the Old Testament and the Gospels. (Ps. lxxiv. 21; 1 Cor. i. 27).

Glory.—The stronger rendering for Peter's (1 Pet. i. 6) ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, analogous to Paul's expression in 2 Cor. xii. 9. A real glorying or a rendering prominent by glorying, inasmuch as such glorying is in contrast with egotistic self-

glorying; or also the condition of Divine grace and assistance.

In his exaltation; ἐν denotes the object in which they shall glory, as a foundation of their well-being. It is the glory, given now already in the form and inwardly, which hereafter however shall also be outwardly manifest (see 1 Pet. 1), the process of its development being diametrically opposite to the rich man's flower. Ὕψος is therefore not=steadfast courage (Augusti), or only future exaltation (de Wette), but=*sublimitas jam præsens, sed etiam adhuc futura* (Theile, Huther).

Ver. 10. **But the rich in his humiliation.** Here we must evidently repeat καυχάσθω. As to the irony contained in this clause (Thomas, Beza and al.), it is not much greater than that in the preceding sentence: let the lowly glory in his exaltation; for 1. such glorying emancipates from vain-glorying, 2. the rich also finds a source of comfort and praise in the full knowledge of his humiliation and its blessed import (see Matth. v. 3).

Because as a flower of the grass.—An Old Testament figure applied to man in general, Job. xiv. 2; Ps. ciii. 15, to the ungodly with particular emphasis, Ps. xxxvii. 2 (Ps. xcii. 8). But here it is not to be explained with reference to the ungodly (so Huther), but as a historical figure with reference to the decay of the Old Testament glory, which in a surprising manner exhibits the realization of the law of the universal decay of human glory, even as foretold by Is. xl. 6 etc. to which this passage doubtless has special reference. But in this decay there lay really concealed a consolation (just as in the universal decay of man), at which the thoughtful theocrat might well rejoice. The flower of the Old Testament glory was decaying, but the fruit-time of the Gospel of the New Testament had set in; "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people!" Hottinger has erroneously referred ἄνθος to Is. xi. 1, where the LXX render נֵצֶר by ἄνθος. The words "flower of the field" (Is. xl. 6) are changed into "flower of the grass" with reference to v. 7 "the grass withereth and the flower fadeth." So in the parallel-passage 1 Pet. i. 23, 24.—

The fate of the rich. v. 11.

Ver. 11. **For the sun rose** (*already*).—This again is not only the colouring of the preceding, but considering the reference to Is. xl 6 etc., this passage contains an application to Jewish history perfectly intelligible to an Israelite. What Isaiah had represented as having been done in the Spirit, was now fulfilled in reality; the old theocratic glory of Israel had passed away with the crucifixion of Christ. Hence the Aorists ἀνέτειλε etc., as symbolical expressions, must retain their literal force and neither be construed as used for the Present (Grotius and al.), nor as the mere representation of whatever repeats itself in one past fact (Huther). This historical style serves, of course, the purpose furnishing us with a lively picture in the rapid succession of the separate stages of the process of decay (Winer).

The sun with the burning heat (wind).—Grotius, Pott and al. distinguish ὁ καύσων, the hot, burning wind which accompanies the rising sun (or the arid East wind, קָדִים which coming from the desert of Arabia scorches the plains of Palestine) from the sun itself, referring to Ezek. xvii. 10; xix. 12; Hos. xiii. 15 etc. Huther, however, applies the expression to the scorching heat of the sun and cites Is. xlix. 10, Matth. xx. 12; Luke xii. 55. But in Is. xlix. 10 the heat of the sun is expressly distinguished from the sun, as a higher degree of the ordinary sunshine which oppresses Orientals, and the reference is to the relation of this incumbrance to *men*, so also in Matth. xx. 12, while in Luke xii. 55 the sun is not mentioned at all. The supposition that sunrise and the development of the sun's heat are forthwith imperilling vegetation, would be almost too strong even to an Oriental imagination. To this must be added the presence of the Article before καύσων. But the view, that the sun with the development of its power frequently wakens the hot wind, as a kind of supplemental counterpart of its beneficent operation, is current in Holy Writ. So according to Mal. iv. the day of the Lord comes hot as a burning oven on all the proud, while the Sun of Righteousness rises with healing in His wings on all that fear the Lord. So Matth. xiii. 6, the scorching heat is distinguished from the rising sun; in the interpretation of the parable v. 21 it is called tribulation or persecution because of the word. Now, as we Occidentals make use of the well-known symbolical language, "the rising sun calls up vapor, fog, and thunder gusts," so the Oriental is wont to say, "it wakens the hot wind." Hence the application of this passage to Christ (Laurentius), was not far from its real meaning, but we do not press it; at all events the hot wind of the law, which scorched the glory of Israel, was developing with the sun of the finished revelation. And indirectly it was also the effect of the sun itself ("a stone of stumbling etc.").

And the beauty of its appearance.—Huther connects the second αὐτοῦ not with τὸν χόρτον but with τὸ ἄνθος. But we cannot imagine that a fallen flower is still to lose its beauty; the flower is gone with the falling; the flower itself and not only its beauty. And thereby (by the falling of the flower) the grass or the plant itself lost all its beauty, the dress of its appearance, without, however, having wholly perished. And this was then precisely the case of Israel. Its flower had fallen away in the most significant manner; like grass, low on the ground, it continued vegetating in its cumbersome existence. The word εὐπρέπεια occurs only here in the New Testament; πρόσωπον often denotes outward appearance. Ps civ. 30; Matth. xvi. 3 etc.

Thus also shall the rich man, that is: the fate of the withered, stunted plant, or the general fate of the Jewish people will also be the fate of each individual Jew or Jewish Christian if he persists in the conceit of his riches, or refuses to learn to glory in his humiliation. οὕτως=so quickly, so thoroughly." Wiesinger. "Μαραίνεσθαι, α ἅπαξ λεγ· in the New Testament occurs in the LXX. as the translation of יָבֵשׁ Job xv. 30, in the same sense, Wisd. of Sol. ii. 8." Huther.

In his journeyings.—Luther has "in his possession," which rendering rests on the false reading πορία (=εὐπορία, good way, favour of fortune, wealth). Herder, following Laurentius and Piscator, "in his journeyings," with reference to ch. iv. 13. Huther, "in his ways" (=ὁδοῖς, v. 8; cf. Prov. ii. 8). Wiesinger, "in his walk," with reference to de Wette, "in his luxurious enjoyment of life." The word denotes in classical language 1, a going, a journey; 2, walking along, course. In LXX, *way*, Nah. ii. 5; Jer. xviii. 15; Jon. iii. 3, 4; but also a *journey*, 2 Macc. iii. 8; cf. Luke xiii. 22. From these passages it is evident, that πορεία is not used as much as ὁδός in a metaphorical sense. We avoid therefore this expression and render: in his journeyings (of fortune). Huther: "The prominent idea is, that the rich man, overtaken by judgment, perishes in the midst of his doings and pursuits as the flower in the midst of its blossoming falleth a victim to the scorching heat of the sun."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. If the purely evangelical character of the Epistle of James has ever been impugned, its opening words may be referred to as furnishing proof that we are moving not on the ground of the Old Testament, but on that of the New. *Joy as the burden of salutation* is the watchword given to the first readers of the Epistle, who, however, were troubled by manifold temptations. Luke ii. 10. The beginning of the Epistle of James sounds like an echo of Christ's first sermon at Nazareth, which the Author had probably heard, Luke iv. 18, 19. This χαίρειν makes him homogeneous with Paul (Phil. iv. 4) and Peter (1 Pet. i. 6), the beginning of whose Epistle exhibits a remarkable agreement with the beginning of that of James. James, like Elihu, knows a God "who giveth songs in the night." Job. xxxv. 10.

2. The very beginning of the Epistle testifies of the truly Christian as well as of the morally exalted character of its Author. The demand "to count it all joy if one has fallen into manifold temptations," has so lofty and bold a sound as to prompt the question whether such a demand is not beyond the reach of man's ability. Cf. Heb. xii. 11. Such a demand must severely strike the natural man as a piece of consummate folly and scandalize him. For counting temptation *all joy* is infinitely more than to be silent in it and to pray, even more than to be grateful for it; it is not sufficient that we readily submit to temptation, but we must glory in it that it is so and not otherwise, and this not only in isolated temptations but in the many temptations which spring from the sufferings of earth. Cf. Rom. v. 3. Such a demand makes the Festuses exclaim "James, thou art beside thyself." Acts xxvi. 24. But the Christian, hearing this first word, feels and is conscious of the spirit of him who addresses him in that word. For how could flesh and blood have been able to reveal what is here so clearly and explicitly put on record, viz. the Christian's deepest grief at once the source of his highest joy? No other religion, beside the Christian, had raised the suffering of earth to a new ground of gratitude. Bacon's saying is well known: "Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament, adversity that of the New." Compare the treatise, still worth reading, of F. V. Reinhard, *de præstantia religionis Christianæ in consolandis miseris etc.*, and on the other hand the *Diatribe de consolatione apud Græcos, auctore A. C. van Heusde, Traj. ad Rhen.* 1840.

3. *Since ye know.*—In order to make a joy like that which he had just recommended to them possible to their πίστις, James now points to the fruit of their γνῶσις. Faith also had a science of its own, but a science, different in kind although not inferior in value and reliability to the knowledge whose province is purely natural. On the one hand even Christians are constrained to acknowledge "we are but of yesterday and know nothing," Job viii. 9, but on the other, the things which were hidden from the wise and prudent are revealed to them, Matth. xi. 25, 26. And this science is fully competent to enable him to secure the joy here recommended; he knows from whom the temptation comes, he knows the purpose temptation serves, viz. *the proof of faith.* This view alone is calculated to reconcile him to the sufferings he has to endure. It is not chance if the Christian, more than many others, falls into manifold temptations, as little chance as if the smelter, in order to refine gold or silver, heats the furnace to a certain degree. Still less is it a just punishment but rather a means of purification, improvement and education, without which it is impossible for us to attain any degree of greatness in the kingdom of God. Thus we have here also a confirmation of the words of Seneca: "*Opus est ad notitiam sui experimento. Quod quisque possit, nisi tentando haud didicit.*

4. Christian *endurance* is infinitely diverse from stoical indifference with its motto: "*res mihi, non me rebus subjungere conor.*" It has a more sublime origin, a milder character, a greater duration, a more glorious fruit.

5. It is remarkable that James insists in the very beginning of the Epistle upon Christian perfection, so that in v. 4 the same word is twice used. So also the perfect law, ch. i. 25, the perfect man, ch. iii. 2, etc. Cf. the beautiful essay of Ad. Monod in his *Adieux*, 1856: "*Tout dans l'Ecriture est idéal.*"

6. The exhortation in v. 4 contains the profound hint that where endurance has its perfect work, the Christian, as to principle, is perfect and in nothing deficient. For where Christian endurance holds sway, there the power of sinful selfishness is broken, of selfishness which perchance would love to take a position either independent of God or higher than God, but in no event under God. For the heroism of faith is evinced in two ways, it is suffering or militant. The former is higher than the latter, because it demands the greatest self-denial, and he who really attains to it, by so doing carries also within himself the principle of Christian perfection.

7. The short Epistle of James treats relatively much of prayer, see ch. i. 5; iv. 2, 3, 8; v. 13–18. Herein also the Apostle appears as the true servant of Him who not only did conduct His disciples to the school of prayer, but was to them in this respect also a pure and perfect pattern, Luke xi. 1. The manner in which James speaks

of prayer shows clearly that he recognizes a direct connection between prayer and its answer, not only in the sense of modern unbelief that prayer can only psychologically exert a beneficial influence on the heart of the person praying, but also that prayer is the Divinely appointed means for the direct obtaining of our wants, which also without such prayer we should certainly not receive. If prayer were only psychologically operative on the person praying, it would be altogether inexplicable why James also so earnestly and emphatically enjoins prayer for *others* (intercession, ch. v. 13–18), as in the former case prayer could not possibly be of any use to them. Cf. this commentary on 1 Tim. ii. 1–7.

8. The Christian never needs more wisdom than when in temptation everything depends upon his enduring it in the right manner and according to the will of God. We often speak of the wisdom which men need in prosperity lest they become ungrateful, haughty or arrogant and this assertion is correct. But in adversity also we need the Divine light not less if we would truly understand the lesson God is teaching us thereby and not be driven by our own excited feelings into lamentable error. This was duly understood and appreciated by the sacred bard, Ps. xciv. 12. There never was a sinner converted by the highly praised benefit of tribulation alone, as long as the Lord Himself did not render the wholesome chastisement efficacious with the rod of His Word and the light of His Spirit. In the day of tribulation we probably need Divine wisdom even more than in the days of joy; wisdom in order that we really choose the true way without turning to the right or to the left; wisdom, in order that we may understand what God wants us to do when He denies us the realization of some cherished desire, or when He lays on us a heavy burden, etc.

9. What James says of the indispensable necessity of faith in prayer, is also taken from our Lord's own teaching, Matth. xxi. 21, 22. His charming figure of the waves of the sea originated probably in his own recollection of the lake of Gennesareth. The striking truth of this figure is best understood, if we apply it to our inward experience of life. The soul is like the sea, but doubt blows over it like a tempest which upheaves the waters from their lowest depth; in such a condition, the heart of the δίψυχος is not susceptible of the enjoyment of answer to prayer. Cf. 1 Kings xviii. 21, where the expression "to halt between two opinions" [German: "to halt on both sides."—M.], indicates a similar inward breach, with a probable allusion to a bird limping from twig to twig without finding rest anywhere.

10. James seems to present us with a new paradox in the exhortation (v. 9) "*Let the brother, who is low, glory in his exaltation.*" There is however an exaltation seen by God and the Lord, which does not depend upon earthly honour and perishable riches and is mostly to be found where superficiality would last and least look for it. To be humiliated can only be irritating and disagreeable to flesh and blood; but if it happens for the sake of Christ's name, if the humiliation is borne with the eye turned to Christ and united to Christian nobility of soul, then it is not counted a disgrace, but borne as the highest honour. Cf. Matth. v. 11, 12; Acts v. 41, 42. Here we are involuntary reminded of Pascal's beautiful saying concerning man: "*Gloire et rebut de l'univers, s'il se vante, je l'abaisse; s'il s'abaisse, je le vante.*"

11. The number of the rich who were able to glory in their humiliation has always been small. Cf. Matth. xix. 23–26. Still history here and there shows us individuals in the fire of the fiercest assault and temptation. Hear only *e. g.* the splendid language of Chrysostom in his speech after the fall of Eutropius, *Opera*, vol. 3, p. 586, ed. Montf. "Why did we not tremble? Because we do not fear any of the adversities of this life. What could inspire us with terror? Death? We run so much the sooner into the haven of repose. The loss of earthly riches? Naked I came out of my mother's womb and naked I shall return into the mother-womb of the earth. Exile? The earth is the Lord's and what therein is. False accusations? Rejoice and be exceeding glad when men shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for great shall be your reward in heaven. I saw the swords above me and looked up to heaven. I expected death and thought of the resurrection. I looked at earthly adversities and counted up the blessings at the right hand of God. I looked upon the perils and my eye beheld in spirit the crown of glory. What I am constantly preaching in my sermons, was constantly preached by the deed in the market-place. The wind blows and scatters the leaves, the grass withers and the flower fades." (The last sentence probably contains an indirect allusion to James i. 11.)

12. The crown of life, of which James here speaks, presents not only a contrast to the perishable laurel-crowns for which the Greeks contended in the games, but also to that fading flower to which James referred in the preceding verse (v. 11). In the doctrine of the reward of grace accorded to persevering faith, James is in prefect agreement with our Lord and His other Apostles. Cf. Matth. xix. 28; 1 Cor. ix. 24–27; 1 Pet. v. 4; Rev. ii. 10; iii. 21. His mentioning the crown of life which is ready for all who love the Lord, affords a not indistinct view of "the election of grace."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

V. 2–8. Epistle for 3d Sund. in Lent, v. 9–12 Epistle for 22d Sund. after Trinity in the Grand Duchy of Hesse and elsewhere. [V. 1–12 Epistle for St. Philip and St. James's Day in the Church of England and the Prot. Epis. Church in the U. S.—M.].

How the vocation of being servants of Jesus Christ was especially committed to the authors of the New Testament and how it still is the prerogative of all believers.—The servant of Jesus Christ can do nothing better than to strengthen his brethren.—In Christ is joy for all people.—How Christianity renders possible what seems to be impossible.—The sufferings of this time the Christian's proof of faith. It is this very fire-proof [noun, to give the full force of German "Feuerprobe"] which establishes 1, the genuine-

ness 2, the standard and 3, the intrinsic value of this gold of faith. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 7.—Endurance under all temptations the daughter of faith, the mother of all other virtues.—The Christian life a God-consecrated sacrifice which must be without spot or blemish. "Ask, what I shall give thee," 1 Kings iii. 5.—The difference between Divine and human benevolence, cf. Sir. xviii. 18. The great value of believing prayer and its indispensable necessity in times of great temptation. The curse of wavering; the value of Christian decision of character. — Riches and poverty viewed in the light of faith.—Abasement the way to exaltation, want the way to enjoyment, fighting the way to the crown.—The beatitude of the servant of Christ (v. 12) compared with the beatitudes of the Master, Matth. v. 3–12.

On the whole section vv. 1–12.—The Christian's threefold duty in temptation: 1. *Suffering* (v. 2–4), *a.* with grateful joy: *b.* with enduring patience; 2. *Prayer* (v. 5–8), *a.* for a precious gift at the hands of a magnanimous giver; *b.* in simple faith without any doubt; 3. *Glorying* (v. 9-12), *a.* in the present conflict; *b.* in the expectation of the future crown.

THOLUCK (Sermons I. 5, 340) on v. 2. "Why the Christian counts his temptation all joy." 1. He knows whence it comes; 2. He knows whither it leads.

STAAG:—The Christian's behaviour in crosses and temptations: 1. The bliss of the cross; 2. the prayer of the cross; 3. the disposition of the cross; 4. the promise of the cross.

BECK: (v. 5)—The true wisdom.

KLEMM:—The prize in the arena of life.

DRÄSEKE:—Humility the condition of all true moral greatness, for it is, 1. its beginning, 2. its food, 3. its support and 4. its crown.

ARNDT: — Happy is the man who endures temptation.

PORUBSZKY: (vv. 1–4).—The temptations of faith: 1. How they are occasioned. 2. How they effect endurance. 3. How they excite believing activity.—(v. 5). Prayer the first act of faith.—(vv. 6–8). The doubter's torment and deliverance.—(vv. 9–12). Through abasement to exaltation. I. The end: exaltation, 2. the means: abasement.

STARKE:—To be the servant of God is to a believer a precious title of honour, in which he may always glory.

CRAMER:—The Church of the New Testament is not confined to one locality as in the time of the Old Testament, "but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him" Acts x. 35.

QUESNEL:—One of the chief cares of conscientious teachers is to comfort those who suffer for the Lord's sake, 1 Cor. xiv. 3.

HEDINGER:—Great art! To laugh in weeping, to be glad in sadness. But there is still time to learn it; our strength is nothing, it is altogether God's work and doing, Phil. iv. 11–13.

CRAMER: — Different medicines are required for different maladies, different chastisements for different sins, Tit. iii. 3.

STARKE:—Sincere faith is not dead but alive and works all manner of good, 2 Pet. i. 5, 6.—Crosses and suffering promote patience just as the wind strengthens the roots of the tree, v. 2.—He that has begun well must persevere unto the end or all former labour is lost.—Patience in the first hour is not sufficient. The end brings the crown.—It is great wisdom to bear suffering aright, and that wisdom is of God's supplying.

HEDINGER:—A rich man who is charitable is a rare spectacle; to be giving and never tire of beggars is more than human; but to give above all that we can ask is Divine (Eph. iii. 20).

OSIANDER:—Because God does not angrily upbraid us with His benefits, therefore we should still less reproach our neighbour with the good we show him.

LANGII OP.:—The highest honour which a creature can confer upon God is to trust Him in every thing by faith and to rely in the full assurance upon His promises, which is also the purest worship, Rom. iv. 20, 21.

QUESNEL:—Faith is the fountain of Christian prayer; the stream does not flow, if the fountain is dried up, Rom. x. 14.—True believers are not fickle and changeable, but constant and steadfast, Col. ii. 5.—Would you serve God, then let it be your serious endeavour not to tempt God.—A divided heart longs not for God, Matth. xxii. 37.—A poor believer is as much a brother in Christ as a rich, Philemon v. 16.—Humility and abasement have been made by Christ true exaltation, Job. xxii. 29.

HEDINGER:—Riches are not culpable in themselves, but they may easily make men haughty.

CRAMER:—God willeth that the rich and the poor should dwell together.

LANGII OP.:—The transitoriness of life and instability of outward prosperity are to be well considered.

HEDINGER:—Rich and ungodly—a double hell-rope. Take care that avarice put it not round your neck, 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10.

LANGII OP.:—Believing Christians are not only the subjects but the sharers of Christ's reign, as those who rule and govern with Him, 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.

CRAMER:—What is marred by the crown of thorns, which we have to wear here on earth, will be amply compensated by the crown of life in heaven, 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18.

STIER:—In order to do justice to the deep, rich meaning of every word and sentence of this Epistle, we have ever to begin with the beginning without ever exhausting its fulness. What a sermon might be preached on the single *joy* (*χαίρειν*) which sounds into our tribulation.—What a lofty saying is the verse connected with it—"Count it all joy if you fall into manifold temptations," etc.

HEUBNER:—Proofs (trials) a Divine blessing.—To have a good beginning and to omit the prosecution is disgraceful.—Wisdom, that is not from God, is no wisdom.—Faith and prayer are mutual conditions.—Where the will is still wavering, there is no trust.—1 Sam. ii. 30 holds good of belief and unbelief.—Christianity exalts a Christian above his station.—It is a touching spectacle, that commands respect, to see a Christian, whose position in the world is commanding, clothed with humility.

[v. 1. It is the duty of the Church to send greetings of joy to the dispersed children of God and to use every means for turning the wilder-

ness of the dispersion into the garden of the Lord. (Missionary Sermon)—v. 2. The true Christian sees in temptation of every kind and of every degree cause for unmingled joy. Cf. Rom. v. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 12.—v. 3. The Christian in the furnace: 1. Experiencing the heat of temptation, 2. Rejoicing in the watchful care of his superintending Master, 3. Jubilant at the result of the fiery process. Mal. iii. 3; 1 Pet. i. 7.—vv. 4, 5. *γνῶσις* may be acquired in the schools, *σοφία* is the gift of God. Cf. Lactantius, "*on true and false wisdom.*"—True wisdom the gift of God to prayerful believers.—The characteristic of true wisdom—it makes wise unto salvation.—v. 6. The doubter like a wave. *a*, in his conduct—driven hither and thither, by contrary winds or lashed into a billow by the tempest; *b*, in his end—touching the shores of safety but dissolving into spray and returning to the treacherous sea.—v. 7. Instability the characteristic of schism.—v. 8. The mountain is reached from the valley.—v. 9. The riches of wealth—the riches of learning—the riches of station—the riches of earthly honour no grounds for glorying.—True riches are riches toward God.—vv. 10, 11. The fate of earthly greatness symbolized in the fate of the flower. v. 12. Earthly afflictions and trials destined to become amaranths in the crown of life.—On the whole section James i. 1–12 compare John xiv. 1–14.—M.].

[Bp. Conybeare: v. 4.—Our very joys are broken and interrupted, and our distresses are so frequent and sharp, that we scarce know how to support ourselves under them: and yet borne that must be which cannot be avoided by us. The will of God must be submitted to by His creatures, both in the ordinary dispensations of Providence and in the more eminent exercise of its powers. Patience will then come in as a necessary duty in common life. We need it almost every day on some occasion or other; and therefore should arm ourselves with such principles as may enable us to go through with innocence.—M.].

[*That ye may be perfect and entire.* Probable allusion to the sacrificial victims which must be without blemish. The sacrifice of body, soul and spirit with all we have and hold, as a reasonable service rendered unto God by His faithful servants.—M.].

[v. 5. Dr. Jortin:—The wisdom of resisting any sort of temptation may very well be extended so as to mean pious wisdom in general, or a practical knowledge of our duty and true interest, by which we shall overcome every thing that opposes and endangers our salvation.—M.].

[Bede:—This text contains a warning against the erroneous notion of Pelagianism, that men may obtain wisdom by their own free will, without Divine grace. Cf. v. 16, 17.—M.].

[Wordsworth:—The description of the Divine bounty is like a summary of our Lord's words, exhorting to prayer. Matth. vii. 7–12.—M.].

[Bp. Andrewes:—This text presents the strongest motives to genuine liberality. See Wordsworth.—M.].

[v. 6. Bp. Sanderson:—A large and liberal promise; but yet a promise most certain and full of comfortable assurance, provided it be understood aright, viz., with these two necessary limitations: if God shall see it *expedient*, and if man pray for it *as he ought* . . . . To make all sure then here is our course. Wrestle with God by your fervent *prayers:* and wrestle with Him too by your faithful *endeavours;* and He will not for His goodness' sake, and for His promise' sake He cannot, dismiss you without a blessing. But omit either, and the other is lost labour. Prayer without study is presumption, and study without prayer is Atheism. v. 8. Hermas says of the double-minded man: "Cast away from thyself double-mindedness; be not anywise two-minded in asking of God; say not, how can I *ask* of God and obtain it, when I have sinned so much against Him? Nay, but rather turn with thy *whole heart* to the Lord and ask of Him without hesitation and thou shalt feel the abundance of His mercy, for He is not like *men*, who *remember injuries;* but if thou doubtest in thy heart, thou wilt receive nothing from Him, for they who doubt concerning God, are the *double-minded* men and receive none of their requests." Hermas, *Pastor*, *Mandat.* 9, p. 596 ed. Dressel. See also Wordsworth and Whitby, who produce other passages.—M.].

II. THE THEME.

THE BEATITUDE OF ENDURANCE IN TEMPTATION AS A WARNING AGAINST YIELDING TO IT.

Chapter I. 12.

12 Blessed *is* the man[1] that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord[2] hath promised to them that love him.[3]

Verse 12. [1] The reading ἄνθρωπος in Cod. A. and several minuscule Mss., being a false correction, calls attention to the significant ἀνήρ.

[2] ὁ κύριος is wanting in A. B. Cod. Sin., and rejected by Lachmann, Tischendorf, (Alford—M.) and al. Theile retains it with G. K. (C. without the Article) and al. the Syriac, [Armenian—M.] and other versions. Several minuscule Mss. and versions [Vulg. Syr. Copt. Aeth. and al.—M.], read ὁ θεός. As the insertion is more readily accounted for than the omission, we may presume that the Apostle in λήμψεται reverts to λήμψεταί τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου [v. 7—M.]. But summary sentences have generally a summary mode of expression. We follow therefore Bouman. p. 63.

[3] Lange: Blessed (is) the man . . . . for when he has become approved . . . .

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

That this verse contains the proper theme of the whole Epistle and indicates the dominant fundamental idea of the same follows from the twofold consideration that 1. the same thought comes up already in the Introduction v. 2 and 2. that it is repeated in a corresponding final theme at ch. v. 7. It is a beatitude after the manner of the sermon on the mount and moreover the last of these beatitudes of our Lord, in which all the preceding ones blend (Matth. v. 10, 11), appropriately adapted to the situation of the readers in the time of James.

Blessed (is) **the man.**—ἀνήρ instead of ἄνθρωπος not only with reference to Ps. i. 1, for it occurs repeatedly (see v. 5, here, v. 20 and ch. iii. 2) and we have already intimated that it may be accounted for by the temptations of the time, which James had in view, making the round especially among Jewish *men*. Thomas appears to have noticed, but not to have understood this characteristic, as would seem from his comment: "*beatus vir, non mollis vel effœminatus, sed* vir."

Who endureth temptation.—[Bengel reads with K. L. ὑπομενεῖ, Future; but ὑπομένει is the ordinary reading and, the blessing being absolute, the tense is immaterial.—M.]. Although the proposition is valid and will be valid as a general dogma, the πειρασμός here does not primarily denote the concrete unity of all the πειρασμοί mentioned in v. 2, for the reference to these very πειρασμοί runs through the whole Epistle. Therefore not: ὅταν περιπέσῃ (Wiesinger). Hence ὑπομένει like ὑπομονή in v. 8 and μακροθυμήσατε ch. v. 7, etc.

Because when he has become approved. One who has become approved, not only proved: one who has become approved by the fact of proof. [He has stood the test of the δοκίμιον v. 2 and thereby has become δόκιμος—M.]. The idea is identical with that expressed in ch. ii. 23: Abraham has become the friend of God by δικαιοῦσθαι. And here we see how James and Paul agree in their dogmatical views, for Paul also mentions the δοκιμή as the consequent of ὑπομονή Rom. v. 3. But the subjective and inner side of this proof is σφραγίζεσθαι according to Eph. i. 13. Krebs, Augusti and al., have found here an allusion to the trial preceding the contest of the athletes, but such an allusion is out of place, so is that of Gebser, Theile and al., to the refining of metals by fire, for that figure presupposes the idea of refining, which although involved in the trial or proof, is not identical with it. The same situation presupposes the certainty of success in refining, questions it in the trial and endangers it in temptation. De Wette and Wiesinger reject a figurative reference; but the crown of life, which is here promised, at least reminds us of the idea of the race-course also in Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 24; 2 Tim. ii. 5.

He shall receive the crown of life; στέφανος, garland, chaplet of victory or honour in its fullest significance. denotes a crown and in this sense we are warranted to take it here, according to Matth. v. 9 and Rev. v. 10.—Τῆς ζωῆς is explained by Huther as the Genitive of apposition: "The ζωή i. e. eternal, blissful life is the crown of honour wherewith he that endures is adorned." But Jno. iii. 36 says: "he that believeth hath everlasting life"; does "the crown of righteousness" 2 Tim. iv. 8 signify "righteousness is given me as a crown?" If the crown denotes the crown of honour of the finished proof, matured in the life of faith but also objectively awarded and glorified by God, it is the crown of life, *i. e.* the crown granted to a life which has developed itself into coronation, as life, the *Summum* of life as life's prize of honour; our Genitive is consequently the Genitive of possession or dependence. Cf. 1 Pet. v. 4, Rev. ii. 10. If the legal men [*i. e.* sticklers for the Jewish Law. M.] of that time were perhaps wont to say with reference to Ps. i.: Blessed is the man that ever keeps to the law, he is the tree by the rivers of water, his leaves do not fade *i. e.* his life shall retain perpetual freshness, the beatitude of James expressing his continuance and promise of life would receive a peculiar significance. Although we cannot assert with Zwingli, Michaelis, Wiesinger and al., that the foundation of this figure is as in 1 Cor. ix. the idea of the Grecian games, it may be shown that the Jews also regarded the crown or diadem not only as "a symbol of *peculiar* honour" (Huther referring to Ps. xxi. 4; Wisd. of Sol. v. 16, 17), but also of an honour accorded by God to a *well-endured* warfare of life. Both the Jews and the Greeks started with the presumption that persevering wrestling in a higher course of life constituted the condition of the diadem and that presumption repeats itself more or less among all mankind in the most diversified forms. This law of life was recognized in the Old Testament especially in the case of the typical Judah, of David, of the ideal man (Ps. viii.), and of the Messiah (Ps. cx.). The crown of believers is contrasted with the perishable garland of honour in 1 Cor. ix. 25 and it is also alluded to in 1 Pet. i. 4; v. 4. Why is the antithesis here wanting? The Jews and the Jewish Christians of that time might readily remember it; all their visionists wanted to see the day of the kingdom of Zion, of the coronation of their chiliastic Messiah, the crowning of the Jewish rulers of the world. On this account Peter also points the suffering Christian pastors to the crown of glory (1 Pet. v.) and the promise of the Epistle to the Hebrews also is the kingdom which cannot be moved (Heb. xii. 28).—

Which He (the Lord) **has promised.**—See Critical Note. "If ὁ κύριος is the right reading, it signifies not Christ (Baumgarten, Schneckenburger), but God (Gebser, Theile, Wiesinger [and Alford—M.]." Huther.—But that means nevertheless: God revealed in Christ. But might not James by this very omission have designed a supplying which he had prepared in v. 1?—

To them that love Him.—Ch. ii. 5; Ps. xcvii. 10; cxlv. 20; Rom. viii. 28; 2 Tim. iv. 8. The love of the Lord, with James and Paul is consequently the real and eternal nature of faith, its root, its sap and its crown; and it is love which proves itself in endurance and by it attains to completion. Cf. Jno. xv. [*Amor parit patientiam.* Bengel.—M.].

[In *Shemoth Rabba*, sect. 31, p. 129 and in *Rab. Tanchum* p. 29, 4, we read: "Blessed is the man, who stands in his temptation; for there is

no man whom God does not *try*. He tries the *rich*, to see if they will open their hands to the poor: He tries the *poor*, to see if they will receive affliction and not murmur. If, therefore, the rich *stand in his temptation*, and give alms to the poor, he shall enjoy his riches in this world, and his horn shall be exalted in the world to come; and the holy blessed God shall deliver him from the punishment of hell. If the poor *stand in his temptation*, and do not repine, he shall have double in the world to come."—M.].

For "DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL" and "HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL" see the preceding section.

III. FIRST ADMONITION WITH REFERENCE TO THE FIRST FORM OF TEMPTATION: VISIONARINESS.

CAUTION AGAINST THE VISIONARINESS WHICH REPRESENTS THE TEMPTATION AS GOD'S CAUSE. THE HIDEOUS FORM OF THE SELF-TEMPTATION OF THE ERRING AND THEIR END, DEATH.—THE OPPOSING IMMUTABILITY OF THE FATHER OF LIGHTS IN HIS BLESSING RULE AND THE EXALTATION OF HIS PRINCELY CHILDREN BORN BY THE WORD OF TRUTH.

CHAPTER I. 13–18.

(VV. 16–21. *Epistle for Fourth Sunday after Easter.*)

13 Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God:[1] for God cannot be
14 tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: But every man is tempted, when
15 he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it
16 bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death. Do not err,
17 my beloved brethren. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and
cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is[2] no variableness, neither sha-
18 dow of turning.[3] Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should
be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures.

Verse 13. [1] Only several minuscules sustain the reading τοῦ θεοῦ. [τοῦ is omitted by A. B. C. K. L.—M.] Cod. Sin. reads ὑπὸ θεοῦ, but in v. 17 erroneously ἀποσκίασματος. Lange: "No one, who is tempted [stands in temptation] shall say: I am tempted from God, for God is not temptable in respect of evil things, but He Himself tempteth [out of Himself] no one.

[Let no man, being tempted, say that (ὅτι *recitantis*) I am being tempted from God; for God is not experienced in respect of evil things, but He Himself tempteth no man.—M.]

Verse 14. Lange: . . . tempted in that he is drawn away [rendered an apostate] by his own lust and allured [by his evil inclination.]

[. . . being drawn away and lured by his own concupiscence.—M].

Verse 15. Lange: . . . conceived [is impregnated] . . . , but sin, when it is completed [has ripened] bringeth forth death.

Verse 16. Lange: M. Be not ye deceived, my beloved brethren.

Verse 17. [2] [Cod. Sin. ἔστιν for ἔνι.—M.]

[3] [Cod. Sin. ἀποσκίασματος.—M.]

Every good giving and every perfect gift [donation] cometh [and cometh] down from above, from the Father of the lights [beings of light], with whom there is not existing a change, nor a shadow-casting of a turning.

[Every good bestowing and . . . coming down from . . . with whom there is [essentially] not a change or shadow of turning.—M.]

Verse 18. Lange: Pursuant to free decree hath He begotten us by the word. [of His own Will [because He willed it, Alford; by the act of His own will, Wordsworth.] etc.—M.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

ANALYSIS:—The first form of temptation—visionariness. The representation of the tempting thought as of God's cause and caution against the deceptiveness of this temptation, v. 13.—The hideous form of the self-temptation of the erring and their end,—death, vv. 14–16.—The opposing image of the true God in His blessing rule and His fixed immutability, v. 17.—The exaltation of His princely children begotten by the word of truth, v. 18.

The first form of the temptation—fanaticism, represented as a glorious cause of God, or a Divine admonition.

VER. 13. **Let no one who is tempted say.**—Caution against the deceptiveness of the temptation. It is incorrect to affirm that James opposes ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν to ὃς πειράζεται, etc.; something like Huther, Pott, Olshausen, Schneckenburger and al. For how could any one abide the temptation, without having first been tempted? James in this dehortation refers indeed to those who really say that they are tempted from God (which is also indicated by the forcible participial form) but even these he desires to reclaim while warning his better readers against their error. According to Calvin (and Wiesinger) James here treats *de alio tentationis genere*. But the matter is simply this; James now explains the *one* great πειρασμός according to the separate ποικίλοις πει-

ρασμοῖς and begins with the first form of the temptation.—[The force of the Participle should be brought out in the translation.—M.].

Shall Say,—λεγέτω according to Schneckenburger and al.=*cogitet or sibi persuadeat*, which is of course implied but not all, as Huther justly observes, [Bengel: *corde aut ore*—M.]. James connects this saying with the uncommonly much-saying of the Judaizing Jewish Christians and Jews, to which he alludes.

I am tempted from God.—Grotius, Hottinger and al. have rightly felt that the word 'tempt' bears a somewhat different sense in the two places, while Huther asserts without sufficient reason that the sense in both cases must be identical, viz.: to be inwardly solicited to sin. Let no one say: I am inwardly solicited to sin of God; but with such an exhortation James could not possibly have warned the twelve tribes. Said expositors miss however the correct distinction by saying that in the one instance it denotes: *adversa pati*, and in the other *malis ad defectionem sollicitari.* It is a sententious oxymoron conveying the idea: Let no one say that the impulse, which to him is really a temptation, and in the end a devilish one (ch. iii. 15), in which he is already entangled (πειραζόμενος), is a monition of God, a cause of God, an incentive to maintain His honour. For this the Jews at a somewhat later period did really say in their uprising against the Romans, this they said even then in their fanatical utterings against the pagans, and the Judaizing Jewish Christians said in a similar manner: It is the will of God that we maintain His law and therefore separate from the Gentile Christians, as far as they do not receive the whole law or only in part. But James doubtless chose this poignant mode of expression in order to reproach those sayers with their making, though unconsciously, God the Author of evil. But it cannot be absolutely assumed that he is here inveighing against an impertinence generally or variously current among Jewish Christians, which made them charge God with temptations to evil, of which they were conscious, for we have no data to warrant such an assumption. This was not the language of the Sadducees, nor of the Pharisees, or Essenes (as has been thought by Bull, Ittig and Schneckenburger with reference to their doctrine of the εἱμαρμένη), still less could he aim at Simon Majus (Calov); on the other hand the reference is not simply to the general bias of the natural man to charge God somehow with the πειράζεσθαι, which the Jews might strengthen by misinterpretations of the Old Testament (Huther; see also the Note p. 59; Prov. xix. 3; Sir. xv. 11, 12); for our Epistle deals throughout not with mere generalities, but with concrete relations.—ὅτι is a much used formula of quotation; ἀπό, as Huther observes, is not as strong as ὑπό. [See Winer, p. 382, ἀπό= through influences proceeding from God.—M.].

For God is not temptable.—The reasons for the foregoing in a twofold assertion respecting God. First, He is ἀπείραστος. This ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in the New Testament must not be confounded with the classical ἀπείρατος (in the sense of inexperienced) as denoting: God has no experience of evil (Schulthess, de Wette, Huther). Equally objectionable is the active construction of the word (Luther following the Vulgate '*intentator*'), for its weak grammatical basis, the Genitive κακῶν, its tautology both with respect to what goes before and to what follows forbid the active construction. The passive-adjective construction, however, not tempted, not temptable, which is generally adopted is not only not against grammatical usage as Huther maintains, (see the adjectival ἀκατάστατος v. 8), nor against the connection, as he thinks also. For James wants to strengthen the dehortation, "Let no man say, etc." For this saying, like all fanaticism, was a tempting God, and therefore vain and impious, because God does not suffer Himself to be tempted. Hence we might feel inclined to take κακῶν in the Masculine and to denote evil men; but this would probably be expressed more definitely. To think of evils (Oecumenius) is somewhat far-fetched, but also the evil in the Singular would be too general; the Plural in the present connection points to concrete and intensively *evil things.* [But there is an insuperable objection to Lange's derivation of the word from πειράζω; for ἀπείραστος is=untempted, not temptable: but James argues not concerning God *being tempted*, but concerning God tempting. I therefore prefer the common usage of the word 'inexperienced in'; so Alford, Winer and (in part at least) Wordsworth, who adds, "that James may perhaps refer to the false tenet of some of the heretics of the early Church, who said that it was the duty of men to have *experimental knowledge of all evil*, in order to the attainment of perfection." See Palm and Rost's Lexicon and Weststein for examples in favour of '*inexperienced in*'.—M.]. Secondly: **But He Himself tempteth no one.**—[Lange takes no notice of δὲ which has here adversative force and makes therefore against his rendering 'not temptable,' while it favours the rendering 'inexperienced in;' and δὲ here is="not so, but" Alford.—M.]. Second negation aimed at the substance of the proposition "I am tempted from God" (Huther). Αὐτός is construed differently; Huther takes it as antithesis to what follows in the sense: it is not *He* who tempts, but every man is tempted etc. Theile and Wiesinger take it in contrast with what goes before: He Himself (self-active). And this is probably right; He suffers Himself not to be drawn by God-tempting fanatics into their unholy interests, but He Himself becomes tempter to no man; the solicitation to evil, in the trial which He appoints, is not from Him. Stress must therefore be laid on both—*not He,—tempteth not any one.* [Lange hardly does justice to Huther whose view is very lucid. "Let no one say when he is tempted to evil, from God I am tempted: for God has no part in evil: but as to the temptation, *He* tempts no man etc."—M.].

[Wordsworth here quotes Augustine, *Tractat. in Joann.* 43 and *de consensu Evang.* ii. 30, who raises a question on this passage. If God *tempts no one*, how is it that He is said in Scripture to *tempt Abraham* (Gen. xxii. 1)? To which he replies that St. James is speaking of temptations arising *from* evil *motives* with a view to an *evil end. No such* temptations are from *God.* But God is said to have tempted, that is, to have *tried* Abraham, from a good motive and for a good end. He tried him, in love to him and to all

men, in order that he might become the Father of the faithful and be an example of obedience to all ages of the world." See also Tertullian *de Orat.* c. 8. "God forbid that we should imagine that He tempts any one, *as if He were ignorant* of any man's faith, or desired to make any one fall. No, such ignorance and malice belong not to God, but to the devil. Abraham was commanded to slay his son, not for his temptation but for *the manifestation of his faith*, as a pattern and proof to all, that no pledges of love, however dear, are to be preferred to God.—Christ, when tempted by the devil, showed *who* it is that is the author of temptation, and *who* it is that is our *Guardian* against it."—M.].

With reference to the seemingly contradictory passages Gen. xxii. 1; Deut. viii. 2 and others, it is first of all necessary to distinguish as much between temptation and obduracy as between Abraham and Pharaoh. According to the concrete expression of the Old Testament God tempts Abraham by subjecting him to a trial to which the popular idea, handed down by tradition, clings as an element of temptation. He tempts Pharaoh by subjecting him to a trial in which the judgment of his self-delusion must reach its consummation. God therefore has no part whatsoever in the temptation itself as a solicitation to evil but throughout concurs in it, in the beginning trying or proving, at the end judging, at the intermediate stages chastising and punishing. It is with reference to the punishing feature in temptation that we pray: lead us not into temptation. God, as Calvin remarks, is never the author of evil.

The hideous form of the self-temptation of the erring by evil concupisence and its fruit—death. vv. 14–16.

Ver. 14. But every one is tempted.—Wiesinger wrongly insists upon the necessity of distinguishing the being tempted in this verse from the falling into temptation v. 2, as an intrinsical occurrence. The representation of tempting lust under the figure of an unchaste woman rather shows that James thinks of the lust belonging to the person tempted objectively in some folly which he encounters extrinsically, just as in Prov. vii. 5, etc. But he is quite right in opposing the above drawn course of good demeanour in temptation to the now drawn course of misdemeanour. But this point we shall touch further on. The objective folly, therefore, encountered by the person tempted, is, according to the Apostle's idea, really nothing else than his very own (ἰδία emphasized) lust; first, because it springs also, as the temptation of Satan and the world, from the same ungodly ἐπιθυμία, from the *alter ego* of his own sinfulness, and secondly, because his evil lust which has now become objective can only control him by his subjective evil lust. If, according to a well-founded distinction, we are tempted by the world, the devil and our own flesh and blood, we must further explain this thus: the temptation of the world and the devil also is in its nature uniformly homogeneous worldliness and selfishness and it is only in a man's self-own and subjective evil lust that temptation is able to become to him an ensnaring temptation in a narrower sense. Thus the great temptation of that time was everywhere only *one* temptation both to the Jews and the Jewish-Christians; all those glittering, variegated visionary expectations which seductively met the individual, had sprung from the matter of the chiliastic, world-lusting, spiritual pride. It is on this property in the dazzling object that James lays principal stress, because every one must overcome the world and Satan in his own strength by overcoming himself. In the first place we have now to inquire why he renders the ἰδία ἐπιθυμία objective in the figure of the unchaste woman. According to Theile and Wiesinger the words: *Every one*, etc., should be construed thus: *Every one is tempted by his own lust in that he is lured* etc. The pure expression of the antithesis: "tempted from God," "tempted by his own lust," seems to favour it. But this construction wipes out the figure that follows in its very conception. The sense is rather: "*Every one is tempted, in that he*," etc., according to the construing of Luther, de Wette and Huther; viz., his own inward concupiscence meeting him as a soliciting unchaste woman. For this image is immediately indicated by the verbs ἐξέλκειν and δελεάζειν. Schneckenburger observes on it: *Verba e re venatoria et piscatoria in rem amatoriam et inde in nostrum tropum translata.* ἐξέλκειν (in N. T. ἅπαξ λεγ.) and δελεάζειν are not synonymous (Pott: *protahere in littus*), in fact it has hardly a specific meaning in the *res venatoria* (Schultess: *elicere bestias ex tuto*); but in the *res amatoria* we may distinguish it from allurement proper in that it draws men from their intrinsicality and independence by dazzling interest (to draw off and to allure—Germ. *ablocken* and *anlocken*); δελεάζειν (from δέλεαρ=*esca exposita ad capienda animalia*) occurs also 2 Pet. ii. 14, 18, and is used also by the classics metaphorically, always in a bad sense. Now we must not overlook the force of the Participles ἐξελκόμενος etc., they denote the process of development (becoming) in the course of which temptation becomes entanglement as far as man continues in it. He is first drawn out from his inward self-control and fortress and then attracted (drawn to) by the unchaste woman's allurings. [This is the reason why I have retained the Participles in my translation.—M.]. But the intrinsical decision proper is further expressed by εἶτα συλλαβοῦσα. 'Επιθυμία however does not denote "innocent sensuousness." "The word occurs here, as it always occurs in the N. T. (except where its specific object is indicated, as in Luke xxii. 15; Phil. i. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 17) also without the addition of κακή, σαρκική, or some similar adjective, *in sensu malo*." Huther. 'Επιθυμία is not, indeed, birth-sin *per se* (as Huther rightly observes), but just as little only an evil lusting for the commission of the deed springing from birth-sin, as he argues against Wiesinger, whose almost equivalent exposition he scruples to admit. It is birth-sin itself in its concrete activity ("*prava concupiscentia*") viewed from its positive side as worldliness and selfishness, assuming in different situations innumerable variations. Maintaining with Pott the figurative description of different personifications, we find that the reference is not to four but to three generations. We have in succession the unchaste mother or the ἐπιθυμία, the unchaste daughter or ἁμαρτία in the narrower sense of deed-sin and

the son and grandson of the voluptuous mothers, the murderer-son death. Man yielding with his will to the allurement of evil lust, his moral relations assume a kind of natural sequence and the rest follows of itself. Lust becomes impregnated and brings forth sin, while sin brings forth (as it were out of itself or pursuant to its essential connection with *ἐπιθυμία*—hastening along with its own maturity the maturing of the hereditary death-germ) death.

Ver. 15. Then, when lust hath conceived.—This denotes man's proper surrendering to his evil lust in a manner which indicates that it was to be expected because he kept standing (continued,) in the allurement (*δελεαζόμενος*). The evil lust is fecundated *i. e.* it has obtained the mastery over the will of man.

It bringeth forth sin. (וַתַּהַר וַתֵּלֶד).—De Wette and al. make *ἁμαρτία* denote the intrinsical act of sin and *ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα* the extrinsical deed-sin. But Wiesinger and Huther are right in saying that the intrinsical act is involved in *συλλαβοῦσα*. On the other hand Calvin, Schneckenburger, Wiesinger and al. take the *ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα* to denote the whole sinful life. But Huther says that it denotes the equal deed-sin, yet, in its entire development passing through its different stages until it subjects man to itself so that all reaction is at an end. "For *ἀποτελεῖν* is neither = *perpetrare* (Pott), nor = *operari* (Laurentius), nor = *τίκτειν* (*τεχθεῖσα*, Baumgarten), but = to complete; hence ἡ *ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα* = sin advanced to the completeness of its development. Now since sin makes its first appearance as a new-birth the allusion to the now matured unchaste young woman which several commentators have found in the *ἀποτελεσθεῖσα*, is not outside the cycle of James's thoughts; the expression certainly brings out the idea that she did reach a false *τέλος* which is the opposite of the *τέλος* to which the believing Israelite attains in virtue of his well-demeanour. True Judaism has matured into Christianity, Judaizing into antichristian apostasy. In point of meaning the exposition of Wiesinger coincides pretty much with that of Huther, but the latter has the preference of firmly keeping up the image of sin itself in its process of completion.

Bringeth forth death.—"The word *ἀποκύει* (found in the N. T. only here and in v. 18) differs from *τίκτει* only in that the former indicates more clearly that the *ἁμαρτία* is from the outset pregnant with the *θάνατος*." Huther.—Huther and Wiesinger explain death both of temporal and eternal death, Rom. vi. 23. But between the two lies the historical, indeterminate (*unabsehbar*) death (which being indeterminate must therefore be distinguished from absolute death [*Untergang*]), and as soon as we consider the concrete import of this passage, this feature of death becomes of the utmost importance. And here we have to call attention to the antithesis which Wiesinger has found between vv. 3, 4 and this passage. The first proposition that "the trial of faith by tribulation answers to the incitement of the will by lust" we consider to be false; to fall into temptation and to be tempted are identical. But the consciousness of the *πειράζεσθαι* and the *ἐξελκόμενος* and *δελεαζόμενος* in connection with the antithesis of operative *πίστις* there and operative *ἐπιθυμία* here, this is one real antithesis; the second is the *ὑπομονή* there and *ἁμαρτία* here. Again the *ἔργον τέλειον* there and the *ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα* here; lastly the *τέλειοι* there (connected with the *στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς* v. 12) and the *θάνατος* here. The last two antitheses Wiesinger has taken together. Applying now the whole passage to the circumstances peculiar to the time of James, the completed sin denotes the completed apostasy of the Jewish people and death their historical judgment (see ch. v. and Rom. x.). This of course does not exclude the more general meaning of our passage which opens the prospect of eternal death as well as the most specific meaning according to which every mortal sin is followed by spiritual death. We have still to notice the different dogma-tropes: sin brings forth death (James), sin is followed by death as its wages or punishment (Paul), sin is death (John).—Likewise we must guard our passage against the [Roman] Catholic inference that sin as such must be distinguished from evil concupiscence (lust) with Calvin: "*Neque enim disputat Jacobus, quando incipiat nasci peccatum, ita ut peccatum sit et reputetur coram deo, sed quando emergat.*" James, to be sure, and all Holy Scripture prompt us to distinguish intrinsical deed-sin or the evil counsel of the heart from the direct and natural motions of sinful desire. Lastly we must avoid the presumption that James by the use of this frightful image simply wanted to didactically prove that temptation does not come from God; he also wanted his readers to understand it as to its real nature, origin and working. Hence the further admonition: "Be ye not deceived." [Alford develops another view of the above image. "The harlot *ἐπιθυμία*, *ἐξέλκει* and *δελεάζει* the man: the guilty union is committed by the will embracing the temptress: the consequence is that she *τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν* sin, in general, of some kind, of that kind to which the temptation inclines: then ἡ *ἁμαρτία* that particular sin, when grown up and mature—herself *ἀποκύει*, '*extrudit*,' as if all along pregnant with it, death, the final result of sin. So that temptation to sin cannot be from God, while trial is from Him."—He also recalls the sublime allegory in Milton's Paradise Lost (Book II) where Satan by his own evil lust brings forth sin ("out of thy head I sprung"), and then by an incestuous union with sin

(—— Back they recoil'd afraid
At first and called me sin, and for a sign
Portentous held me; but familiar grown,
I pleased and with attractive graces won
The most averse, thee chiefly, who full oft
Thyself in me thy perfect image viewing
Becam'st enamour'd, and such joy thou took'st
With me in secret, that my womb conceived
A growing burden.—)

causes her to bring forth Death.—M.].

Ver. 16. Be not ye deceived.—Although this sentence refers also to what follows (Theile) and not solely to what goes before (Gebser) the reference to the latter (Wiesinger) is greater than that to the former. The expression, moreover, has the full pregnancy of a warning against objective images and spirits of temptation, according to de

Wette, "be not ye deceived," and not with Gebser, "err not." The warmth of this caution is heightened by the address:

My beloved brethren, although they were to find the means of strengthening and confirming this exhortation in the subsequent instruction concerning the true God of revelation. Huther: "The same formula is found in 1 Cor. vi. 9; xv. 33; Gal. vi. 7 (a similar one 1 Jno. iii. 7 [μηδεὶς πλανάτω ὑμᾶς—M.], in all these passages it follows up a thought peculiar to the Christian consciousness, *by which an antecedent statement receives its confirmation.*" [Wordsworth: The formulas μὴ πλανῶ "be not *thou* deceived," and μὴ πλανᾶσθε "be not *ye* deceived," are the preambles used in Scripture and by ancient Fathers, in order to introduce cautions against, and *refutations* of some popular error, as here.—M.].

The opposing image of the true God, etc.

Ver. 17. **Every good giving** (bestowing).—We ask leave to reproduce the Hexameter (see *Winer*, § 68, 5a, p. 663) because nothing but a close consideration of the text has led us to do so. [The German rendering is as follows: "*Jegliche gute Bescherung und alle vollkommene Gabe*"—the Greek original reads thus: πᾶσα δό|σις ἀγα|θὴ καὶ | πᾶν δῶ|ρημα τε | λειον, the last syllable in the second foot σις being lengthened by the arsis.—M]. Standing by the side of δώρημα, δόσις can hardly have the same meaning as the former (as Huther maintains); δόσις rather denotes primarily the act of giving and secondarily the gift. But alongside of δώρημα, which denotes gift, donation, present, it becomes at all events the lesser giving, while δώρημα is the more weighty expression. To this must be added the gradation of the adjectives ἀγαθή, τέλειον. It is certainly unfounded to apply δόσις to gifts of nature and δώρημα to gifts of grace, but this does not involve an identity (so Huther) which is here very tautologically expressed. Τέλειον must be made the starting-point of the exposition. According to the New Testament idea of τελείωσις, τέλειον corresponds with the ἔργον τέλειον and the Christians as τέλειοι, and with the ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα, v. 15. And just as the perfect work can only be understood as the consistent practical exhibition of the theocratical faith in Christianity, and as the τέλειος describes one who has decided for Christ, while sin completed denotes the sin of Christ-inimical apostasy, so also δώρημα τέλειον signifies the gift of God completed in Christianity. Our δώρημα reminds us of Christ as χάρισμα, Rom. v. 15; but here the reference is probably to the Christian revelation in the fulness of its gifts. This would make πᾶσα δόσις to denote everything which served to prepare this completed gift in the olden time, especially in the old covenant, according to the analogy of Heb. i. 1. The readers here and there should know that the one and only God presides over the difference and antithesis between the Old Covenant and the New. It is not to be wondered at that several commentators (Raphelius, Augusti) were tempted to take πᾶσα and πᾶν in an exclusive sense, for the antithesis lay near: God tempts no man, nothing but good comes from Him. This would be a more distinct statement of the antithesis, but James wanted to present it in a richer form: not only does no evil come from God, nay rather all good comes from Him. It is moreover ἄνωθεν καταβαῖνον in uninterrupted permanence, a perpetual rain and sunshine of gifts. The Participle is to be duly considered and we ought really to render: it comes and comes. The word *gift* for δώρημα is rather weak and donating would be more weighty than donation. [Bengel renders δόσις *datio* and δώρημα *donum*. On the whole δόσις=*datio*=giving, and δώρημα=*donum*=gift, is probably the nearest rendering which the Latin and English tongues admit. Bp. Andrews, who has two sermons on this text, vol. iii. p. 36, and vol. v. p. 311 observes p. 313, that δόσις ἀγαθή, *donatio bona* or *good giving*, represents rather the act of giving which bestows things of *present use* for this life, whether for our souls or bodies, in our journey to our heavenly country; but δώρημα τέλειον or *perfect gift*, designates those unalloyed and enduring treasures, which are laid up for us in eternity. I have retained the *Participle* in my translation.—M.].

From the Father of the lights.—Huther and Wiesinger agree with the majority of modern commentators that the lights here signify the heavenly bodies. But we do not believe that a single passage of Holy Writ can be produced in support of such an abnormal mode of expression. Ps. cxxxvi. the LXX. say concerning the stars τῷ ποιήσαντι φῶτα μεγάλα, Jer. iv. 23 τὰ φῶτα αὐτοῦ. But Scripture as well as the Nicene Creed uniformly distinguish *make* from *create* and *beget*. Job xxxviii. 28 surely does not mean that God is the father of rain. Setting aside the following explanations of the lights: *knowledge* (Hornejus), *joy* (Michaelis), *wisdom or goodness* (Wolf), it is hardly necessary to think of the *Urim and Thummim* (Heisen) and even the reference to the angels (Kern and Olshausen) cannot be retained. But the reference to the Sermon on the Mount, with which James is so intimately connected, is less remote. In Matth. v. 14, the disciples are called τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου and in v. 16, they are actually distinguished from their light as candlesticks or light-bearers. The Messiah is often called a Light in the Old Testament (Is. ix. 2; xlix. 6, etc.) and in the New Testament it is an appellation by which He describes Himself (Jno. viii. 12; cf. ch. i. 4 and other passages). Also John the Baptist He calls a light Jno. v. 35 and Phil. ii. 15 Christians are referred to: ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ. If in favour of the aforesaid exposition it is alleged that God Himself is called φῶς 1 Jno. i. 5 (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 15) it is necessary clearly to distinguish that ethical idea from the physical. The subsequent metaphors: παρ' ᾧ, are claimed in favour of the disputed exposition; but they constitute an antithesis between God, the Light without shadow and the symbolical bodies of light, which are not without casting their shadows. Besides all this, believers as *God-begotten* children are distinguished in v. 18 as an ἀπαρχή from the κτίσματα. The *Scholion ap. Matth:* ἤγουν τῶν ἀγγελικῶν δυνάμεων, ἢ τῶν πεφωτισμένων ἀνθρώπων, seems accordingly to be right in the last clause in the sense that the whole line of organs of revelation from Abraham to Christ as the representatives of all good spirits is what is meant here, [Bengel: *Patris appellatio con-*

gruens huic loco; sequitur ἀπεκύησεν. Ipse Patris, et matris, loco est. Est Pater luminum etiam spiritualium in regno gratiæ et gloriæ. Ergo multo magis Ipse Lux est, 1 John i. 5. Lucis *mentione statim, ut solet, subjungitur mentio* vitæ, *ex regeneratione.* v. 18. There is no reason why the two interpretations should not be combined. God is the Father of *all* lights, the lights of nature and the lights of grace; the Father not only of the light of reason and conscience, the light of knowledge and goodness but also the Father of the children of Light. To enter in this connection upon hair-splitting distinctions between create, make and beget, seems hardly the thing. Whatever is gross and material is of course eliminated from the meaning of any of said three expressions, and if the spiritual conception of the Divine character as Maker, Creator and Father, has once been reached, metaphysical quibbles may well be dispened with.—M.].

With whom (as peculiar to whom) **there is not existing.**—We give this construction of the passage on account of ἔνι, without discussing the question whether ἔνι is a peculiar form (Buttmann, Winer), or an abbreviation of ἔνεστι (Meyer, Huther).

A change or a shadow-casting.—In the first place it is to be remembered that these words are ἅπαξ λεγ. in the New Testament. Then the first word, being the more general, must be explained by the second and more definite one. The Greek commentators limit the figurative to the ἀποσκίασμα (Oecumenius, Theophylact and al.): with God there is no mutation or a shadow (*i. e.* a trace or appearance of a change, or also of a reservation; they are followed among modern expositors by Morus, Rosenmüller, Hensler, Theile. The Latin commentators, on the other hand (Justinianus, Estius, a Lapide and al.) apply the expression *ad solis vicissitudines et conversiones.* Then also Luther (see the Translation), Grotius, Wetstein, Flatt, Schulthess. For a full treatment of the passage see Gebser, who explains it of the shadows cast by the solstice. Wiesinger suggests changes of the moon, solar and lunar eclipses and regards the shadow as the effect of τροπή; similar is the exposition of Huther: the shadow cast on the heavenly body, effected by its changing position. But solar and lunar eclipses are phenomena too rare and transient in order to give a pregnant expression to the idea in question. And although there may not be used here any *termini technici* of Astronomy (as Huther observes) in their strict sense, the contemplation of the world in every age led probably to a sufficient knowledge of astronomy in order to recognize in the diurnal phenomenal revolution of the sun, the moon and the stars the cause of all nocturnal obscurings of the earth. The sun has not only its annual but its diurnal solstice. In like manner the moon and the stars rise and set and leave us in absolute night. But God is in a very different sense the Light of the world, a Sun that never sets. To this refer Ps. cxxxix. 9, 12; Job. xxxiv. 22; it was also symbolized by the pillar of fire in the camp of the Israelites. Now if the expression τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα denotes such a *phenomenal* shadow-casting of the revolving heavenly bodies, we can hardly take παραλλαγή in a purely general sense (Huther)=mutation, but as a figurative description of a change of position (standing-place). This alternation is the first thing: the constant progression of the celestial bodies, the turning, follow as the result. Now if the heavenly bodies, as the created symbols of the Divine being of light, possess the property of being not without shadow and night we get the antithesis that God, the Father of the Lights is eternally the same, not only *per se,* but also in the phenomena of these lights: that is to say, He makes no revolution with the Old Testament which could cast a night-shadow on the New (as the Talmud at a later period attempted to make such a revolution), nor does He suffer the New Testament to cast a night-shadow on the Old (according to the later opinion of the Gnostics and of all rationalists). The Father of the lights remains unchanged even in this antithesis. ["God is always in the meridian." Wetstein.—Bengel's note will be found useful: "*παραλλαγή dicit mutationem in intellectu;* (vide LXX. 2 Reg. ix. 20), *τροπή mutationem voluntatis. In utroque vocabulo est metaphora a stellis, huic loco, ubi* luminum *mentio fit, aptissima. παραλλαγή et τροπή est in natura* (vid. τροπὰς Job. xxxviii. 33) *quæ habet quotidianam vicissitudinem diei et noctis, et longiores modo dies modo noctes: in Deo nil tale est. Ipse est Lux mera, παραλλαγή et τροπή, si qua accidit, penes nos est, non penes Patrem luminum. ἀποσκίασμα interdum dicit ὁμοίωμα. Sic enim Hesychius interpretatur. unde Gregorius Naz. τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἴνδαλμα καὶ ἀποσκίασμα tanquam synonyma ponit: et apud Tullium, Budæo observante,* adumbratio rei *opponitur* perfectioni ejus; *sed hoc loco opponitur* luminibus, *adeoque magis proprie sumitur, ut ἀποσκίασμα τροπῆς sit* jactus umbræ primulus, revolutionem habens conjunctam. *Idem Hebraismus genitivi mox,* abundantiam malitiæ, *ex quo colligere licet,* τὸ transmutatio *opponi τῷ* datio bona, *quemadmodum* vicissitudinis obumbratio *opponitur τῷ* donum perfectum. *παραλλαγή aliquid majus est. Hinc gradatio in oratione negante:* ne quidem vicissitudinis adumbratio. *Hoc demum efficit* perfectionem; *illud* bonum *est.* Perfectior *est, qui ne quidem vicissitudinis adumbrationem habet.*"—M.].

The exaltation of the children of God begotten by the word of truth.

Ver. 18. **Pursuant to free decree hath He begotten us.**—The connection of these words with what goes before is differently construed: 1. as coördination: God the Father of lights is also the Author of our regeneration (Theile); 2. as exemplification: *generatio spiritualis, quasi exemplum aliquod donorum istorum spiritualium* (Laurentius, de Wette); 3. as an inference drawn from the general idea of the former (Huther). But regeneration, as matter of experience, cannot be inferred from a dogma concerning God; 4. as proof or demonstration (Gebser, Kern). Wiesinger's remarks are excellent: "The greatest δώρημα (v. 18) which consists in the Divinely effected regeneration of man by the word of truth, is now mentioned by the author in lieu of everything else as the brightest actual proof that nothing evil, but all good comes from God. This act of His holy love is at once the strongest exhortation to a demeanour well-pleasing to Him. (v. 19 etc.)." The Apostle shows therefore how

the heaven-descended δώρημα τέλειον had evidenced itself as such by its effect, viz. the regeneration of believers. Now in thus laying the strongest emphasis on the exalted dignity, the ὕψος of Christians following from their regeneration, he also emasculates thereby the fallacy of that seductive fanaticism, which would fain mislead them to pursue a false phantom of this exaltation on chiliastic and revolutionary paths. At the same he presents to all Jews this true life-picture of their exaltation. Βουληθείς is the emphatic beginning of the sentence. "*Pursuant to his established* (Aorist) *free decree.*" The element of love (Bengel: *voluntate amantissima*) lies primarily not in the word itself but in its connection. The antithesis is (according to Bede, Calvin and al.) the meritoriousness of good works. It lies however nearer to see the primary reference to the Jewish claims to the kingdom (Rom. ix.), especially because the βουληθείς at any rate contains the element of voluntary determination. The verb itself, used here, shows plainly that reference is made not to natural birth, but to regeneration, ιυr ἀποκύειν is the synonyme of γεννᾶν etc. (1 Jno. iii. 9; 1 Pet. i. 23; 2 Pet. i. 4)." So Huther rightly answers Pott, who wants to explain ἀποκύειν by *facere, efficere.*

Us, i. e., the Christians. But the objective regeneration of humanity in Christ was primarily also designed for the Jews as the regeneration of the nation and the theocracy, and to this teleological element the sequel constrains us to give a proper share of our consideration. Besides this objective element, subjectively realized by believers, we must also take cognizance of the emphasis: begotten by the Father of lights and thus destined to the enjoyment of the most exalted dignity. [Bengel, as usual, gives us the pith of the whole riches of thought in a nutshell and supplies commentators with mental food. Much of Lange's view may be traced back to Bengel, and some of the beautiful reflections of Wordsworth, which we shall produce under *Doctrinal and Ethical*, seem to flow from the same source. He says: βουληθείς, volens, *voluntate amantissima, liberrima, purissima, fœcundissima.* Hebr. אב ab אבה voluit; cf. Jno. i. 13. *Congruit* ἔλεος, misericordia, 1 Pet. i. 3. *Antitheton*, concupiscentia cum conceperit.—ἀπεκύησεν. *Antitheton*, ἀποκύει, v. 15 (cf. also what he says on v. 17, *Ipse* (*Deus*) *Patris et matris loco est.*—M.].

By the word of truth.—*The Gospel as the completion of the whole word of revelation.* The word of truth regarded not only as opposed to the law as such, or even to the tradition of the law, but especially also as opposed to the lies and frauds of fanaticism which promised to make the readers of the Epistle sons of the kingdom. This also chimes in with the antithesis in time: what the temptation promises you in a phantom, the word of truth has already made us in reality. The word of truth, *i. e.*, the word which is truth (*Genit. Appos.* [cf. Jno. xvii. 17: ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθεια ἐστι—M.)], but also the expression and life of truth (1 Pet. i. 23; cf. Eph. i. 13; Col. i. 5=εὐαγγέλιον; 2 Tim. ii. 15). The whole Epistle shows that James meant the mediation of this word by Christ, but the idea is more general because by this completion, he comprehends into one whole the entire Old Testament as Christianity in process of being (or becoming). [These words are also susceptible of a different interpretation. According to it the λόγος is personal and denotes the Eternal Word, the Second Person in the Holy Trinity, by Whom we have been born again (cf. 1 Pet. i. 23), "Who for our sakes became Incarnate and by being Incarnate gave "to those, who *receive* Him power to become *sons of God*," who are born, not of *blood*, nor of the *will of the flesh*, but of God (Jno. i. 13), and through whom we cry "*Abba, Father*" (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iii. 26), and become "partakers of the Divine nature." Wordsworth. The noble array of authorities, in favour of this interpretation, will be found under "Doctrinal and Ethical."—M.].

That we should be; not that we should *become.* But the teleological mode of expression is probably chosen in order to indicate that the Jews should *become* what Christians already *are.*

A (kind of) **first fruit.**—Calvin: *τινὰ similitudinis est nota; nos quodam modo esse primitias.* So Huther, Wiesinger, Gebser and al. But James hardly needed to give prominence to this symbolical mode of speech in an Epistle, symbolical throughout. It was self-evident. But on that account we are hardly prepared to understand the reference in the word with Bengel: "*quasdam habet modestiam, nam primitiæ proprie et absolute est Christus.*" Christ is here included as Mediator of the Christian first fruit. But James, using this expression, might well recollect that the angels of God are a different kind of first-fruit of the creation. It has been inferred from this passage that Christians are also superior to the angels; at all events they are coördinated with them as a different type of celestial first-born. The frequent occurrence of this word in a symbolical sense (Lev. xxiii. 10; Numb. xviii. 12; Deut. xxvi. 2) removes all doubt that ἀπαρχή alludes to the God-consecrated first-fruit in the Old Covenant (Laurentius: *allusio est ad ritum legalem in V. T. de consecratione primogenitorum, frugum, jumentorum et hominum*). The word therefore involves also the idea that Christians are a people consecrated to the service of God, even as the first-consecrated in relation to the future conversion of the Gentiles and "the glorification of the world." (Huther.) But this does not warrant the inference drawn by Huther and Wiesinger that the first-born in point of time settles the idea of first-fruit in point of dignity. Even in the province of nature the idea of the first-born or matured is more or less connected with the idea of the excellent. In the New Testament, however, this idea of the word in a spiritual sense, is repeatedly made prominent (1 Cor. xv. 20, 23; xvi. 15; Rev. xiv. 4). But there is yet another element of the idea, which has to be decidedly held fast. As the first-fruit was at once the prophecy and surety of the whole subsequent harvest, so Christ as ἀπαρχή of the resurrection is surety for the subsequent stages of the resurrection, so the Holy Ghost in believers is surety for the subsequent glory (Rom. viii. 23); so the first believers of Israel in their unity are sureties for the future conversion of the whole nation, Rom. xi. 6. We see no reason for abandoning any one of these three elements, 1. The God-consecrated

first-fruit people, 2. the first dignity of the real children of God involved in it, 3. the living security for future conversions, even for the glorification of the world. Huther ojects to the second element that instead of τινὰ we ought to have κτισμάτων followed by νέων or καινῶν. But the difficulty with regard to τινὰ has been settled above, and Huther's exposition, not ours, would require a νέων. Even the taking of πρῶτοι in the sense of τιμιώτατοι or some similar word (in Oecumenius) is not against the Apostle's idea; it only presents modifications and consequences of πρῶτοι.

Of His creatures.—This expression which relates generally to the whole creation but particularly to God's moral institutions in mankind, brings out primarily the second sense of ἀπαρχή, as in Ps. viii.; Rom. viii.; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; but also the third sense. Christians as God's ἀπαρχή are not only superior to the doings of the moral world and to the propensities of the natural world, but they are also as God's ἀπαρχή sureties for the glorification of the world. The κτίσματα τοῦ θεοῦ, although they are not really the καινὴ κτίσις (Olshausen), but the ἀπαρχὴ θεοῦ belongs also to them, as a surety that they will ripen into the καινὴ κτίσις, just as the first-fruits are an ἀπαρχή of the ripening fields. The depth of Christian knowledge contained in this passage has been admirably set forth by Wiesinger, p. 88, etc., to which the reader is referred. [We give it below under "Doctrinal and Ethical." —M.]. Particular note should be taken of the striking accord of this passage in James with the fundamental ideas of the doctrine of Paul, in βουληθείς, election, free grace; in ἀπεκύησεν the doctrine of regeneration and the new creature, in the λόγος ἀληθείας the antithesis of law and symbol, in the ἀπαρχή not only the relation of Christians to the world, but in particular the relation of the Jewish Christians to the Jews (Rom. x.), and in the κτίσματα his doctrine of the glorification of the world by Christ, Rom. viii.; Eph. i.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

If there is *one* question, which for centuries has engaged and exhausted the reflection of the most celebrated philosophers, it is this: whence is moral evil? Moral evil, disorder in the dominion of a God of order and justice, a discord in the harmony of creation, an ever-flowing spring of misery by the side of so many and copious fountains of happiness opened for us by a higher Love. Who is the author of its disastrous existence? Does it come from God? If so, how could God be just and holy? And if it does not come from Him, how could it originate, continue and rule from the world's first dawn until now? There is no thinker who has not stood in silent contemplation of the riddle and there is also no thinker who has been able to resist the temptation of making at least an effort towards its solution. The various schools of Greek philosophy exhibit the most contradictory principles. The most different gnostic systems of the second century we see revolve round this problem as if it were their immutable centre. And even the speculative philosophy of our century, no matter how often its idealism departed from the maxims of experience, found it impossible wholly to overlook this dark back-ground of all human self-consciousness and had to include the investigation of evil in the course of its contemplations, if for no other purpose than that of denying the reality of sin as constituting the guilt of mankind. The most important efforts of human thought to explain the origin of moral evil have been discussed in a masterly manner by Julius Müller in his classical work, "*Die Christliche Lehre von der Sünde*" (new edition, 1844.)

2. The principal features of the doctrine, which James here presents concerning the origin of sin, may be compressed into one sentence, viz.: Sin is in no event God's fault but altogether our own. Every explanation of the origin of sin which makes God directly or indirectly the *causa efficiens mali*, James condemns *in toto* (as to its inmost ground), as does also Paul, Rom. iii. 8.

3. Nothing is more common than the endeavour to charge God directly or indirectly with the guilt of our transgressions. Even the heathen sought shelter in the subterfuge that some divinity or irresistible demon had impelled them to evil and the Jews asked "Why does he yet find fault?" Rom. ix. 19. The most ancient art of sinful mankind was the sewing of fig-leaves (Gen. iii. 7), and also the modern rationalism of our century in this respect seems neither to have learnt nor to have forgotten any thing. Sin, in the opinion of modern rationalists, is a relative, yet an altogether unavoidable evil. Is God not the Almighty who creates light and darkness, the Infinite from whom, by whom, and to whom are all things absolutely, the Omniscient, who foresaw the abuse of moral freedom and might easily have prevented it? It is therefore plainly thus: man could not but altogether fall and he falls not only with the high sanction but also according to the will and arrangement of God. Sin is a wholly indispensable part of our earthly plan of education just as a child would never have learned to walk without having previously stumbled. Sin is the inseparable shade-side of the light of perfection, which as it shines is inconceivable without a shadow. Sin is a want of development, an imperfection, grounded *nolens volens* in the organization of our race, for which we can no more be held accountable than for having feet but no wings. Thus sin, which is free choice and a daring opposition to God, is fundamentally made to be a rule and what might yet be wanting to the fair-seeming theory, appears in still more glaring colours in practice. Even the dullest mind becomes inexhaustible in wit and understanding if it is necessary to excuse the commission of evil. There is nothing more difficult even to infant lips than the admission of personal guilt. Now it is the fault of others or of circumstances in which we find ourselves placed, again it is the fault of our temperament or the natural infirmity of an originally excellent heart. Aye, how many a Christian seeks to lessen his guilt with the pious sigh that God had let go his hand for a moment, that the Lord had hidden His countenance from him so that now he could not evince himself as a child of light; that the flesh had proved too strong for him and it was really not he that kept on sinning, but the invincible principle of flesh within himself. If James were to revisit us, he would not

have any occasion to withdraw his exhortation as superfluous: "Let no man, being tempted, say, I am tempted from God."

4. It is only necessary to enter somewhat more profoundly into the idea that God in the most absolute sense of the word is ἀπείραστος κακῶν in order to perceive the infinite superiority of the Christian conception of God to the ethnical. James, in this respect, occupies not only a lofty religious but also a purely ethical standpoint. Just as the conception of God with many is obscured by sins, so on the other hand, the Christian conception of God corrects many confused or one-sided theories of the origin of sin.

5. In order that we may thoroughly understand the teaching of James respecting the origin of sin, we must in particular not lose sight of the point, that it is not so much his intention to account for the origin of sin among mankind as to describe it in the human individual: in other words that he here treats of the matter rather psychologically than metaphysically. Rationalistic commentators who consequently use James i. 14, 15 as a weapon against Gen. iii. and Jno. viii. 44, act most arbitrarily. The matter has two sides only one of which is touched by James, while he does not invalidate the other, no matter how true it may be in itself. Cf. Jas. iv. 7. What he describes is the history of sin in every individual man, and that in three different periods: in its beginning, its progress and its end.

6. James in declaring that lust, having conceived, brings forth *sin*, does by no means imply that ἐπιθυμία *per se* is not altogether sin. The *concupiscentia* in this case is already *prava*, but it is here expressly set forth not as the mother of the sinful principle but of the sinful *deed*. The Protestant Church at every period has rightly opposed to the pelagianizing tendencies of [Roman] Catholicism the assertion that also the ἐπιθυμία of man, which eventually becomes deed-sin, is sinful in itself (*per se*). Paul also denies that the law is sin, not that lust is sin, Rom. vii. 7. Besides the history of every more signal sin, *e. g.*, that of Adam or Pharaoh, David, Ahab and many others furnishes the most striking proofs of the correctness of the delineation here given. "This passage is greatly abused if it is cited as a proof that evil desires are not sin, provided man withhold his consent. For James does not discuss the question when sin begins, when it is sin before God and imputed as sin, but when it breaks forth. Thus he gradually progresses to show that the completion of sin is the cause of eternal death, but that sin is rooted in a man's own lust; whence it follows that men shall reap in eternal ruin the fruit which they themselves have sowed." *Chrysostom.*

7. The idea of guilt, which is here so emphatically expressed by James, is of the utmost importance to the whole development of scientific theology. Not until sin in its true nature is acknowledged as guilt, are we able to appreciate the depth of the doctrines of the atonement and of redemption. But then it must be equally acknowledged that only a Redeemer, who was really *God*-man, was able to deliver us from eternal ruin. The right conception of Soteriology and Christology is thoroughly rooted in the deeper insight into Hamartology.

8. It is impossible that God should be at variance with Himself, that His holiness should conflict with His love. The same God whom James describes in v. 17 as ἀπείραστος κακῶν he sets forth in v. 17 as the eternal source (German *primal* source) of light from whom *all* gifts and only good gifts flow to us. This declaration also reminds us of the Sermon on the Mount, Matth. vii. 11. God is here called the Father of lights, as elsewhere He is described as the Father of spirits, the God of the spirits of all flesh, Heb. xii. 9; Numb. xvi. 22. James describes the inexhaustible riches of the goodness and the glory of the immutability of God in a form at once poetical and metrical "πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ, καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον," in order to show also thereby that the inference "that such a God could yet be the cause of sin" contains the strongest *contradictio in terminis*. For it is impossible that the Father of lights should love darkness; He, with whom there is no change, cannot possibly cause to-day the evil which yesterday He did forbid or punish; detestable sin, so often condemned by Him, in no event can belong to His good and perfect gifts. "The New Testament positively opposes the repulsive assertion of a self-development of God." Heubner.

9. The greatest proof of the absolute impossibility of God being the cause of sin lies in the opposite experience of believers themselves (v. 18), where the greatest and most glorious of all good gifts (v. 17), although stated in general terms, is yet specifically named. The history of the birth of sin (v. 15) is opposed (v. 18) to the spiritual history of the birth of Christians in order to shed thereby the brightest light on the fact that God who effects regeneration, cannot possibly be the author of its contrary—evil. Those who attach but little importance to the Epistle of James in a dogmatical point of view would do well to give their earnest and thoughtful attention to his *dictum classicum* concerning regeneration, v. 18. We have here in fact the depth and riches of Paul in a brief compendium. See the exegetical notes on the passage. James' mode of statement exhibits also a surprising agreement with that of Peter (1 Pet. i. 23).

[v. 15. The progressive development of temptation is thus stated by Bede: 1. *Suggestio.* 2. *Delectatio.* 3. *Consensus. Suggestio est hostis, delectatio autem vel consensus est nostræ fragilitatis. Si delectationem cordis* partus *sequitur pravæ actionis, nobis jam mortis reis victor* hostis *abscedit.* For further illustration see Wordsworth.

v. 16. Bp. Andrewes (*Sermons*, 3, p. 374): "Though of man it be truly said by Job, "he never continueth in one stay" (Job. xiv. 2); though the *lights of heaven* have their parallaxes; yea, "the *angels* of heaven, he found not steadfastness in them" (Job. iv. 18); yet for *God*, He is subject to none of them. He is "*Ego sum qui sum*" (Ex. iii. 14); that is, saith Malachi, "*Ego Deus et non mutor* (Mal. iii. 6). *We* are not what we were awhile since, what we shall be awhile after, scarce what we are; for every moment makes us vary. With God it is nothing so, "He is that He is; He is and changeth not." He changes not his tenor; He says not, before Abraham was, *I was*; but "before Abraham was, *I am*" (Jno. viii. 58).

Yet are there "varyings and changes," it cannot be denied. We see them daily: True, but the point is *per quem*, on whom to lay them? Not on God. Seems there any recess? It is we forsake Him, not He us (Jer. ii. 17). It is the ship that moves, though they that be in it think the land goes from them, not they from it. Seems there any variation, as that of the night? It is *umbra terræ* makes it, the light makes it not. Is there anything resembling a shadow? A vapour rises from us, and makes the cloud, which is as a pent-house between, and takes *Him* from our sight. That vapour is our lust, there is the *apud quem*. Is any tempted? It is *his own lust* doth it; that enticeth him to sin; that brings us to the shadow of death. It is not God. No more than He can be tempted, no more can He tempt any. If we find any change, the *apud* is with us, not *Him;* we change, He is unchanged. "Man walketh in a vain shadow." (Ps. xxxix. 6). His ways are the truth. He cannot deny Himself.

Every evil, the more perfectly evil it is, the more it is from below: it either rises from the steam of our nature corrupted; or yet lower, ascends as a gross smoke, from the *bottomless pit*, from the prince of darkness, as full of varying and turning into all shapes and shadows, as God is far from both, who is uniform and constant in all His courses. .—The *lights* may vary, He is invariable; they may change, He is unchangeable, constant always and like Himself. Now our lessons from these are—

1. Are they *given?* Then, *quid gloriaris?* Let us have no boasting. Are they given, why forget the Giver? Let Him be had in memory, He is worthy so to be had.

2. Are the "*giving*" as well as the "*gift*" and the "good" as the "perfect," of gift, both? Then acknowledge it in both; take the one as a pledge, make the one as a step to the other.

3. Are they from somewhere else, not from ourselves? Learn then to say, and to say with feeling, *Non nobis, Domine, quia non a nobis* (Ps. cvi. 1).

4. Are they from on high? Look not down to the ground, then, as swine to the acorns they find lying there, and never once up to the tree they come from. Look up; the very frame of our body gives that way. It is nature's check to us to have our head bear upward and our heart grovel below.

5. Do they descend? Ascribe them then to purpose, not to time or chance. No table to fortune, saith the prophet. Is. lxv. 11.

6. Are they from the "Father of lights?" (Jer. x. 12) then never go to the children, *a signis cœli nolite timere*: "neither fear nor hope for any thing from any light of them at all."

7. Are His "gifts without repentance?" (Rom. ii. 29). Varies He not? Whom He loves, doth "He love to the end?" (Jno. xiii. 1). Let our service be so too, not wavering. O that we changed from Him no more than He from us! Not from the light of grace to the shadow of sin, as we do full often.

But above all, that which is ex *totâ substantiâ*, that if we find any want of any giving or gift, good or perfect, this text gives us light, whither to look, to whom to repair for them; to the "Father of lights." And even so let us do. *Ad patrem luminum cum primo lumine*: "Let the light, every day, so soon as we see it, put us in mind to get us to the Father of Lights." *Ascendat oratio, descendat miseratio*, "let our prayer go up to Him that His grace may come down to us," so to lighten us in our ways and works, that we may in the end come to dwell with Him, in the light which is φῶς ἀνέσπερον, "light whereof there is no eventide," the sun whereof never sets, nor knows tropic—the only thing we miss, and wish for in our lights here, *primum et ante omnia*. [A part of the above really belongs to "HOMILETICAL and PRACTICAL" but I doubt not that the reader will be thankful to me for not having attempted to sever the practical element from the doctrinal—M.].

[V. 18. WORDSWORTH:—With reverence be it said, in the work of our *Regeneration*, God is both our Father and Mother; and this statement well follows the declaration of the Apostle that *every good giving and every perfect gift* is from above, coming down from the *Father* of lights. He is a *Father*, the *Father* of lights, and He is like a *Mother* also, and gives birth to us by the Word of truth.

Compare the use of the maternal word ὠδίνω, *parturio*, used by St. Paul in one of his tenderest expressions of affectionate yearning for his spiritual children, Gal. iv. 19.

By this word ἀπεκύησεν, *He brought us forth*, St. James declares God's *maternal love* for our souls. Is. xlix. 15. Ps. xxvii. 12.

—The view which makes ὁ λόγος *personal* is not in conflict with the common view; it is based on the recognition of the two senses in which St. James and St. Paul use it. Cf. Heb. iv. 12; Eph. v. 26; Tit. i. 3; Gal. iv. 19. The comparison of this verse (James i. 18) with i. 21 shows that James passes by a natural transition from the *Incarnate Word* to the reception of the *Inspired Word*.

ATHANASIUS (*contra Arianos* iii. § 61, p. 488): "Whatsoever the Father determines to create, He makes and creates by Him (the Word), as the Apostle says. *By His will* he brought us forth by the *Word*. Therefore the will of the Father, which concerns those who are born again, or which concerns those things that are made by any other way, is in the *Word*, in whom He makes and regenerates what He thinks fit."

IRENÆUS (ii. 25, 3):—"Thou, O man, are not uncreated, nor wert thou always coëxistent with God, like His own *Word*, but thou art gradually learning from the *Word* the dispensations of God who made thee."

TERTULLIAN (c. *Praxean*. c. 7) illustrating the word ἀπεκύησεν says: "*Christus primogenitus et unigenitus Dei proprie de vulva cordis Ipsius.*"

NOVATIAN (*de Trinit.* 31):—"There is one God, without any origin, from whom the Word, the Son was born. He, born of the Father, dwells ever in the Father."

THEOPHILUS of Antioch (§ 10): "God, having His Own Word indwelling in His own bowels (σπλάγχνοις), begat Him, having breathed Him forth before all things, and through Him He hath made all things; and He is called the Beginning, because He is the Principle and Lord of all things which were created through Him."

HIPPOLITUS (*Philos.* p. 334):—"The One Supreme God generates the Word in His own mind. The word was in the Father, bearing the Will of the Father who begat Him; and when the Father commanded that the world should be created, the Word was executing what was pleasing to the Father,—The Word alone is of God, of God Himself; wherefore He is God. The Word of God regulates all things, the First-born of the Father. Christ is God over all, who commanded us to wash away sin from man; regenerating the old man, and having called man His image from the beginning; and if thou hearkenest to His holy commandment and imitatest in goodness Him who is good, thou wilt be like Him, being honoured by Him, for God has a longing for thee, having divinized thee also for his glory."

BP. BULL (*Def. Fid. Nic.* III. ch. ii.) says: "The Son of God, born from *Eternity*, is said by the Fathers to have certain other births in *time*. He was born into the world when He came forth to create the world. He was born again in a wonderful manner, when He descended into the womb of the virgin and united Himself to His creature. He is daily born in the hearts of those who embrace Him by faith and love."

BP. PEARSON (p. 219) says: "This use of the term *Word* was familiar to the Jews, and this was the reason that St. John delivered to them so great a mystery in *so few words*." Wordsworth adds that the same remark is applicable to the language of St. James.

BP. BULL (*Def. Fid. Nic.* I. ch. i. § 17–19, and *Harm. Apost. Diss.* 2. ch. xv.). In the latter passage he declares the meaning of St. James to be that our Christian graces proceed from "the good pleasure of God through Christ, and from the regeneration which the Holy Spirit works in us through the Gospel."

WORDSWORTH:—"They whom St. James addressed, being born again by adoption and *created* anew in *Christ Jesus*, the Eternal Word (Eph. ii. 10), might well be said to be designed by God to be *a first-fruit of His creatures*, for they were *new creatures* in Christ (Gal. vi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 17), who is the *first begotten* of every creature (Col. i. 15), the beginning of the creation of God (Rev. iii. 14), by whom all things were created (Col. i. 16). By virtue of His incarnation and of their incorporation and filiation in Him, who is the *first-born* among many brethren (Rom. viii. 29), they were made the *first-fruits* of creation, being advanced to a high preëminence and primacy, beyond that which was given to Adam before the fall (Gen. i. 28) and even above the angels themselves. Cf. Heb. i. 5–13; ii. 5, 7–16."——"This higher sense of λόγος includes also the lower one, God brought us forth by the *Word* of truth, *preached* to the world."—M.].

[The Note of Wiesinger, referred to under "*Exegetical and Critical*" is as follows: "this passage is among those which reveal the depth of Christian knowledge, in which the practical and moral exhortations of the writer are grounded: lying as it does expressly (διό v. 19) at the basis of them. We will here bring together in a few words the teaching of the passage, for the sake of its important bearing on the rest of the Epistle. It teaches us

1. As a positive supplement to vv. 14, 15, that the life of man must be renewed, from its very root and foundation;

2. It designates this renewal as God's work, moreover as an imparting of the life of God (ἀπεκύησε), as only possible by the working of the Spirit, only on the foundation of the objective fact of our redemption in Christ, which is the contents of the λόγος ἀληθείας;

3. It sets forth this regeneration as an act once for all accomplished (ἀπεκύησεν, Aor.) and distinguishes it from the gradual penetration and sanctification of the individual life by means of this new principle of life imparted in the regeneration.

4. It declares also expressly that the regeneration is a free act of God's Love (βουληθείς) not induced by any work of man (Eph. ii. 8, 9; Tit. iii. 5), so that man is placed by God in his right relation to God, antecedently to all works well-pleasing to God: for this the expression ἀπεκύησεν involves: cf. ἐξελέξατο, ch. ii. 5, and in so far as this ἀπεκύησεν necessarily implies the justification of the sinner (the δικαιοῦσθαι of St. Paul), it is plain also, that St. James cannot, without contradicting himself, make this δικαιοῦσθαι, in the sense of St. Paul, dependent on the works of faith.

5. λόγος ἀληθείας is specified as the objective medium of regeneration; and herewith we must have πίστις as the appropriating medium on the part of man himself: of the central import of which πίστις in St. James we have already seen something (ch. ii. 5, 14, etc.).

6. Together with this act of regeneration proceeding from God, we have also the high destination of the Christian, which the Apostle gives so significantly and deeply in εἰς τὸ εἶναι κ. τ. λ. And that which God has done to him, is now in the following verses made the foundation of that which the Christian on his part has to do: by which what we have said under 3, and 4, receives fresh confirmation. This passage is one to be remembered, when we wish to know what the Apostle understands by the νόμος τέλειος (i. 25; ii. 12) and what he means, when (ii. 14, etc.) he deduces δικαιοῦσθαι from the works of faith. As regards the dogmatical use, which we make of this passage, wishing to show that regeneration is brought about by the word, as distinguished from the Sacrament of Baptism (Tit. iii. 5–7), we may remark, that seeing that λόγος ἀληθείας designates the Gospel, as a whole, without any respect to such distinction, nothing regarding it can be gathered from this passage. The word of the Lord constitutes, we know, the force of the Sacrament also. "*Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit Sacramentum.*" And it is meant to be inferred that the readers of this Epistle were *not baptized.*"—M.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

It is impossible to pursue the course of life while we regard God in any way the cause of sin.—The attempt of charging God with the guilt of one's transgression: 1, The traces of this perverseness: a, in the Jewish world, b, in the heathen world, c, in the Christian world. 2. The springs of this perverseness; *a*, in a darkened understanding, *b*, in a proud heart, *c*, in a sinful will.

3, The sad consequences of this perverseness; by it a, God is insulted, b, our brother offended, c, and our own sanctification and salvation opposed.—God in opposition to moral evil.—The ethical excellency of the Christian conception of God, also a proof of its heavenly origin.—No excuse for sin, cf. Gen. iii. 12; Jno. xv. 22.—The history of the development of sin in every individual man: 1, beginning, 2, progress, 3, end.—How very different sin appears *a posteriori* from what it appears *a priori*.—Sin should never be contemplated in the light of speculative understanding only, but always in the light of conscience, the Bible and experience.—The erring Christian also should still be addressed as a beloved brother.—Error manifold, truth only one.—The errors of men in morals are mainly the effect of their not looking up sufficiently to the Father of light.—The riches of God: 1, all good lights come from Him; 2, only good gifts come from Him.—God cannot be tempted to evil but He is never supplicated in vain for good.—The exaltation of the Creator above the most exalted work of His hands.—The constant alternation in the natural world contrasted with the immutable order in the moral world.—The immutability of the Father of lights viewed 1, on its heart-stirring and consoling side, but also 2, on its solemnly-admonishing and warning side.—The miracles of regeneration: 1, God has begotten us, 2, according to His free decree, 3, by the word of truth, 4, that we should be etc.—On the whole lesson v. 13-18. Sin not God's fault but solely our own, a truth, 1, which man is only too prone to forget (v. 13), 2, which confirms the history of the development of sin (vv. 14, 15), 3, which a glance at the being of God (vv. 16, 17) and at the work of God (v. 18), removes beyond all doubt.—On the conclusion: "Do not err," v. 16. "Do not err," how James here cautions us against a threefold error: 1, Do not err, ye who expect the highest good from beneath (the earth): all good giving is from above, 2, Do not err, ye who dwelling on the goodness of God, forget His holiness: the Giver of all good is also the Father of lights. 3, Do not err, ye who think that His holiness in your case would cease to be just: with the Father of lights is neither variableness, nor a shadow of turning.

Starke:—Man as long as he lives in time is liable to temptations.—Every man has a lust and bias peculiar to himself and carries the origin of all his temptations within himself, Jno. xii. 6.

Quesnel:—We ourselves are our own worst enemies by our own lusts, Prov. xv. 27.—Man becomes gradually sinful.—Whatever we receive from above should take us back from below upward to God.—The rivers of God's grace flow from on high into the deep valleys; the lower the heart, the more gentle the supply [influx= the flow of God's grace into the heart.—M.].—If God is the Father of light, then sin cannot be His child. For what communion has light with darkness? 2 Cor. vi. 14.—If believers are God-begotten, they are of Divine descent [a Divine race—M.]. O, what high nobility!

Luther:—The lying word of the serpent has corrupted us but the true word of God makes us good again, Jno. xvii. 17.

Stier:—Nothing good comes from below; not even outward help for outward need (cf. Sir. 38, 8, 9).—Good gifts in general are of no avail without the perfect gift, which restores to us light and life in a regeneration (out of) God.

Heubner:—Being tempted refers not only to solicitations to apostasy from Christianity, from religion by adversities, but James manifestly speaks of sin in general.—Desire remains barren without the will.—All the woe of mankind is the fruit of sin.—Deriving evil from the Being of God is much worse than Parseeism with its dualism.—

Porubszky:—The nature of temptation [*i. e.* its essence—M.], 1, lies not in the outward assault but rather within ourselves; 2, it should not be combated from without but from within.—Of the holy power needed for pious deeds: 1, of the necessity of this power; 2, of its communication.

[V. 13. God permits and overrules the temptation, but is not the Author of it.—God is neither temptable by evil things, nor versed in evil things.—Lust, the enchantress and temptress, cf. Prov. vii. 5-27. See also the admirable portrait of the gossamer approaches of sin in *Southey's* Thalaba, Book 8, 23-29.—God, the Father of lights is not the Author of evil; contrast "Father of lights" and "Prince of darkness."—

Vv. 14, 15. The way to death. 1. Man drawn by his evil inclinations out of the safe asylum of virtue (ἐξελκόμενος); 2. entrapped by the fascinations of vice and evil (δελεαζόμενος); 3. into the commission of voluntary sin (ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν), and 4. ripening in sin, hurried to ruin (ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει θάνατον).—

V. 16. The duty of Christian pastors to caution their flocks against error.—

V. 17. God the Author of good—he cannot therefore be the Author of Evil.—God is the perennial fountain, whence gush in perpetual streams good gifts and perfect gifts.—Good *living* denotes not only temporal blessings but also spiritual—it comprehends the bestowal of every blessing accorded us by the munificence of our heavenly Father in this our *imperfect* state of existence; while *perfect gifts* are those eternal possessions laid up for us in heaven, of which *regeneration* is the beginning and pledge.—God is the *Father* of the lights, not only of heaven, not only of the lights of reason, wisdom, conscience, truth, inspiration and prophecy, but also the Father of the children of light (Luke xvi. 8; Jno. xii. 36; Eph. v. 8; cf. also Matth. v. 14, 16).—M.].

[Wordsworth: v. 13.—St. James delivers a caution against errors, which afterwards showed themselves in the heresies of *Apelles, Hermogenes, Valentinus, Marcion* and the *Manichæans*, which represented God as the *Author* of evil, or as *subject* to evil, and unable to resist and overcome it.—v. 14. Concupiscence is the womb of sin, and the offspring of sin is death. All these are evil and none of these are from God, who is the Author of all good.—M.].

[Didymus: v. 16.—The ministry of *good* is directly and indirectly *from* God; but *evil* comes only *per accidens*, indirectly and mediately, for the correction of man, who is chastened by suffering.—M.].

[WORDSWORTH: v. 18.—Here is an Apostolic protest against two errors prevalent among the Jews, 1. that men are what they are either by *necessity*, as the Pharisees held, or else 2, as the Sadducees taught, by the unaided action of their *own will*, independently of *Divine grace*. See Maimonides in his Preface to *Pirke Aboth*, and Josephus *Ant.* xiii. 5, 9; xviii. 1, 3. Bp. Bull, *Harm. Apost. Diss.* 2, ch. 15. Thus they disparaged the dignity of the *Divine Will*.

[Man in Christ is the *wave-sheaf* of the harvest. See 1 Cor. xv. 20–23—M.].

[RABBINICAL: v. 13.—This is the custom of evil concupiscence; to-day it saith, Do this; to-morrow, worship an idol. The man goes and worships. Again it saith, be *angry*.—Evil concupiscence is, at the beginning, like the thread of a spider's web; afterward it is like a cart-rope. —M.].

[MACKNIGHT: v. 15.—The *soul*, which the Greek philosophers considered as the seat of the appetites and passions, is called by *Philo* τὸ ϑῆλυ, the *female* part of our nature; and the spirit, τὸ ἄῤῥεν, the *male* part. In allusion to this notion, James represents men's *lust* as a *harlot*, who entices their understanding and will into its impure embraces and from that conjunction *conceives* sin. Sin being *brought forth*, immediately acts, and is nourished by frequent repetition, till at length it gains such strength that in its turn it *begets* death. This is the true genealogy of sin and death. *Lust* is the *mother* of *sin* and *sin* the *mother* of *death;* and the *sinner* the *parent* of both." —M.].

[BP. SANDERSON: v. 13.—St. James therefore concludes positively, that every man's temptation, if it take effect, is merely from his own lust. It is then our own act and deed, if we are Satan's vassals: disclaim it we cannot; and whatsoever misery or mischief ensueth thereupon, we ought not to impute to any other than ourselves alone.—M.].

[ABP. SECKER: v. 14.—Temptation has no power, the great tempter himself has no power, but that of using persuasion. *Forced* we cannot be, so long as we are true to ourselves, our own consent must be our own giving: and without it the rest is nothing.—M.].

[DR. JORTIN: v. 17.—The unchangeable nature of God suggests very powerful dissuasions from vice. The Scripture contains no decrees concerning the reprobation and salvation of particular persons, without regard to their moral qualifications. But there is a law which declares that obstinate and impenitent vice shall end in destruction. This law is as eternal and unchangeable, as the nature of good and evil, or the nature and perfections of God. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but this decree shall not pass away: and therefore a fearful thing it is to fall into the hands of the everliving and immutable God. Yet this unchangeable nature of our Creator, considered in another view, affords no less comfort and peace to the greatest offenders, if they will repent and turn to Him. Their offences cannot be greater than His mercy and goodness, which endures to all eternity, ready to receive those who by an effectual repentance and reformation, through the satisfaction of Christ, make themselves proper objects of His mercy.—M.].

[SERMONS and Sermon themes:

v. 13. SHARP, ABP.: *How far God is concerned in temptations to sin.* Works 6, 263.

vv. 13, 14. TILLOTSON ABP.: *The sins of men not chargeable to God.*

vv. 13–15. *Apology for Providence in sin.*

SIMEON, CH. *Sin, the offspring of our own hearts.* Works 20, 27.

v. 15. SAURIN, *La manière d'étudier la religion.* Sermons 4, 1.

vv. 16, 17. SIMEON, CH. *God the only source of all good.* Works 20, 32.

v. 17. BLAIR, H. *On the unchangeableness of the Divine Nature.* Sermons 2, 85.

v. 18. CHARNOCK, STEPHEN, *The instrument of regeneration.* Works 5, 521.

HALL, ROBERT, *The cause, agent and purpose of regeneration.* Works 5, 186.

DODDRIDGE, PHIL., *Address to the regenerate.* Works 2, 536.—M.].

IV. SECOND ADMONITION WITH REFERENCE TO THE SECOND FORM OF TEMPTATION—FANATICISM.

CAUTION AGAINST YIELDING TO THE WRATH OF MAN (*SEXUAL*), WHICH THINKS ITSELF COMPETENT TO ADMINISTER THE JUSTICE OF GOD BUT IS INCOMPETENT TO DO IT. THE INSTRUMENT OF DELIVERANCE AND PRESERVATION FROM THIS ZEAL: THE CULTURE OF INNER LIFE IN FAITH AND THE VERITABLE RELIGIOUS PROOF OF THIS FAITH IN ACTS OF MERCY.

CHAPTER I. 19–27.

(V. 22–27. *Epistle for 5th Sunday after Easter*).

19 Wherefore,[1] my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow
20, 21 to wrath: For the wrath of man worketh[2] not the righteousness of God. Wherefore

lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the
22 engrafted word, which is able to save your souls. But be ye doers of the word, and
23 not hearers only,[3] deceiving your own selves. For if any be a hearer of the word,
24 and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: For he
beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man
25 he was. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth *therein*,
he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this[4] man shall be blessed in
26 his deed. If[5] any man among you[6] seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue,
27 but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion *is* vain. Pure religion and undefiled
before God[7] and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, *and* to keep himself unspotted from the world.

Verse 19. [1] ἴστε is the most authentic reading. A. B. C. Vulg. al. ὥστε found in G. K. [Rec. L. Sin.] is evidently a correction designed to establish a clearer connection, which has however obscured the peculiar import of this section. De Wette and Wiesinger, indeed advocate the retention of ὥστε on internal grounds against Lachmann, Huther and al., but the internal grounds are also in favour of ἴστε and even Tischendorf's reädoption of the reading of the Text. Rec. cannot affect the question. We also read with A. δὲ after ἴστε and καί before ἔστω. Tischendorf now decidedly favours ὥστε; so does Bouman p. 84 sqq.
Lange: Know however .... also let every man etc. [ye know it .... but let etc.—M.]

Verse 20. [2] ἐργάζεται A. B. [C.[3]] Sin., Lachmann; κατεργάζεται C.* G. K. al. Tisch. The former seems to preponderate, but ἐργάζεται has here surely a peculiarly emphatic meaning.
Lange: For the man's [*vir*] wrath doth not accomplish [execute] etc.

Verse 21. Lange: Wherefore, removing all filthiness and all out-flowing [communication of life] of malice [malignity] acquire in gentleness the word implanted in [and among] you, which etc.
Wherefore putting off all filthiness and superabundance of maliciousness, receive in meekness the innate Word, which etc.—M.]

Verse 22. [3] μόνον *before* ἀκροαταί Rec. A. C. K. L. Theile; *after* B. Vulg. Alford.—M.]
Lange: But become ye doers .... as those who ensnare themselves. [But become ye ....deceiving etc.—M.]

Verse 23. Lange: For if ....this man is like to a man who observes the countenance [image of appearance] of his birth [of his development-image, of his life-form, the momentary formation of his continual development] in a mirror.
Because (ὅτι) .... this man is like to a man considering the face of his birth in a mirror—M.].

Verse 24. Lange: For he observed himself and went away and forthwith forgot of what manner he was.
For he considered himself and is gone away .... what he was like (ὁποῖος ἦν, *i. e.* how he looked in the mirror)—M.].

Verse 25. [4] A. B. C. Sin. and al. *omit* οὗτος before ἀκροατής, so Lachmann; Tischendorf following G. K. [and Rec. —M.] *inserts* it. The omission may have arisen from the supposition that the word was superfluous, its pregnant force having been misapprehended.
Lange: But he, who became absorbed in the completed law, that of liberty, and remained thus, who became not a hearer unto forgetting, but a doer of the work, the same shall be blessed in his doing.
But he who looked into the perfect law, that (τὸν) of liberty, and perseveres doing so, being .... in his doing—M.].

Verse 26. [5] δὲ after εἰ, inserted by Lachmann following C., has the most important Codd. against it. It weakens also the recapitulatory character of the sentence.
[6] A. B. C. omit ἐν ὑμῖν.
Lange: If any man [among you] fancieth himself to be a religious man [one theocratically zealous of the honour of God] etc.
German for religious man, "*Gottesdiener*"—a servant of God, one observant of God's outward service; religion "*Gottesdienst*"—outward service of God.—M.]

Verse 27. [7] τῷ before θεῷ recommended by A. B. C.* Sin. al. and Lachmann. This reading is also in consonance with the thought, the reference being to the God of the Christian revelation.
Lange: A pure and unprofaned religion [outward service—M.] before the God and Father is this: to be careful of the orphans and widows in their tribulation [to have the oversight of them, and not to be engrossed with politics], to preserve himself unspotted from the world.
.... before our God and Father (τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ) etc.; παρά—with, in the estimation of Alford.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Analysis. *Caution against the second form of temptation—fanatical, angry zeal.* The clemency of the man who is called to be the child of God or who is already begotten, should be in conformity to the clemency of God v. 19.—The wrath of man [sexual] is not adapted to the ministering of the righteousness of God, v. 20.—They were to purify themselves from this temptation, by acknowledging said sin as a pollution (not peradventure as zeal for Judaistic purity) and as natural maliciousness and putting it off, and on the other hand, by thoroughly appropriating with meekness the word of Christian truth unto the furthering of their salvation, v. 21.—Such an appropriation of the word will be most readily accomplished by their becoming doers of the word and by ceasing to be mere hearers, v. 22–24.—The real doer of the word has two distinguishing marks: he is absorbed with the eye of faith in the contemplation of the perfect law, the free law of Christian truth and proves his perseverance in this contemplation by the full consistency of Christian activity (as described more particularly). By such full energy of life he attains the enjoyment of blissful life v. 25.—Whoever imagines that he is a real worshipper of God and a zealot for the honour of God and corrupts his heart in giving the reins (in fanatical zeal) to his tongue, his religious service is vain. But the counterpart, true worship of God corresponding to the true image-of-God-the-Father, is Christian care of the helpless members of the Church accompanied by a decided shunning of polluting worldly-mindedness. vv. 26, 27.

The clemency which shuns fanaticism and conforms to the clemency of the Father in heaven.

VER. 19. **Know however, my beloved brethren.**—The connection indicated by the reading ὥστε (see *App. Crit.*) deduces from the clemency of God the exhortation that the Christian also should exhibit corresponding clemency. But that reading makes this verse dependent on what precedes, as if it were simply an application, which is not correct. On the contrary we have here the beginning of a new leading thought, viz.: the guarding of Christians against the temptation of fanatical zeal by fully yielding to the spirit of meekness and liberty in Christianity. Hence the reading ἴστε is also preferable on internal grounds. Huther's observation is correct: "v. 18, connects primarily with the exhortation *to hear*—and then with the further exhortation in v. 22 to be not only hearers but doers of the word." "But the hearing here insisted upon must evidence itself as decided, (according to Matth. xiii. 23) as a full and unreserved yielding to the word of truth and consequently as the foundation and not as the contrast of doing. Semler takes ἴστε as an Indicative; *non ignoratis istud carmen* Sir. v. 11, but apart from the difference in expression there and here, the indicative sense weakens without reason the energetical tone of the exhortation. Huther remarks that ἴστε answers to the μὴ πλανᾶσθε v. 16, which view is further confirmed by the use of the same address: ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί here and there; cf. also ch. ii. 5. [But it is not necessary to connect the ἴστε taken indicatively with the exhortation at all: it therefore cannot weaken its energetical tone, on the contrary it strengthens it by its very abruptness. Adopting the indicative sense of ἴστε I connect it therefore with the preceding, as follows: Ye know it, my beloved brethren, but let every man, etc.; or paraphrasing: Ye know that these things are so, but possessed of this very knowledge let every man, etc. ἴστε is used in this sense in Eph. v. 5; Heb. xii. 17.—M.].

Also let every man.—καί (see App. Crit.) indicates that the conduct of man should be in conformity to the conduct of God. It remains to be ascertained in what sense we are to take this sentence. Laurentius and al. make it a general direction; Gebser, Wiesinger and al. give it a distinct reference to "the word of truth;" Huther, Theile and al., say that the general direction had primarily the specific aim of inculcating upon Christians the right conduct also in respect of the word of truth. But all this hardly does full justice to the double antithesis in the words: *slow to speak, slow to wrath.* The Apostle indicates the point in which Christ and Christian religiousness should evidence itself as humanity, but true humanity also as piety —even the centre of faith and humanity as contrasted with inhuman and impious conduct. Hence the express declaration: πᾶς ἄνθρωπος. It is a fundamental law of humanity, which is here described by the antithesis ταχύς and βραδύς (found in Philo, but in no other place of the New Testament, and expressed by Rückert thus: "thou hast two ears and *one* mouth.")—*Being swift to hear* denotes entire readiness, constancy and thoughtfulness of hearing (Matth. xiii. 23) and shows that such real hearing contains the germ of obedience to the truth, just as real "tasting and seeing" involves the experience "that the Lord is good." *Being slow to speak* of course does not exclude all speaking but rash, immature, thoughtless and immoderate talking (λαλεῖν), especially dogmatical speaking ch. iii. 1, although the expression is not confined to it (Pott and al.). The Apostle demands cautious, thoughtful speaking, a speaking flowing from an inward calling and therefore a weighty speaking. *Being slow to wrath* applies in like manner to anger, which is consequently not absolutely disallowed (as Hornejus has truly remarked). Eagerness in speaking by warmth leads one easily to eagerness of passion [Alford: The quick speaker is the quick kindler.—M.]. Huther justly rejects the reference of this wrath to God (Calvin, Bengel, Gebser: "impatience towards God on account of persecution"). For in that case James ought not to have allowed any slowness to wrath. Huther capitally explains this wrath of "carnal zeal aiming at the mastering of our neighbour, the fruit of which is not εἰρήνη but ἀκαταστασία ch. iii. 16; the caution is directed against Christians, who—as did the Pharisees in respect to the law—instead of using the Gospel for their own sanctification, were abusing it in gratifying their love of condemnation and quarrelsomeness." Thus our exhortation in its particular direction is addressed not only to the Jewish Christians but to all the twelve tribes, whose ancestors in fanaticism, Simeon and Levi (Gen. xxxiv.), disapproved by their father (ch. xxxiv. 49), were afterwards mentioned as patterns worthy of imitation (Judith ix.).

The wrath of man not a suitable organ of the righteousness of God.

VER. 20. **For the wrath of man worketh not.**—Our verse gives the reason of the preceding one, but contrasts the two modes of conduct, the right one there and the wrong one here. We attach importance to the distinction that in the former verse reference is made to the wrath of man in general and here to the wrath of man sexually. Thomas perceives in the expression an antithesis between the man and the child, Bengel one between man and woman but neither does conform to or satisfy the historical significance of our expression. We agree with Huther that this sentence must not be referred to the state of being righteous before God (Gebser, Grashof), and with Wiesinger that it must not be to the personal doing of men which is well-pleasing to God (so Huther following Luther—δικαιοσύνη=τὸ δίκαιον a meaning of frequent occurrence in both Testaments); but we cannot stop with Wiesinger at the interpretation of Hofmann that "the wrath (zeal) of man is unable to effect in *others* (*i. e.*, as a zeal of conversion) the righteousness of God, *i. e.*, that "state of being righteous" [*Rechtsbeschaffenheit**], which God begets by this word of truth. For James evidently has respect to the fanatical delusion of wrath, which imagines to administer and work out in the world the righteousness of God especially with reference to unbelievers by passionate words and deeds, in that it only gives reality to

* We consider this term, which through Hofmann has crept into theology, as an abortive improvement on the term "righteousness" (German: *Rechtschaffenheit* or *Gerechtigkeit*).

its unamiable ebullitions. Such was specifically the Judaistic delusion, which begot Ebionism and the Jewish war and which also found afterwards its expression in Mohammedanism and even in the Christian crusades, in the ecclesiastical persecutions of heretics and also in several fanatical heretics (Eudo de Stella, Thomas Münzer, etc.). But that the subjects of this delusion at the same time believe that their wrath (zeal) is the true way of converting men, that thus they are doing a work well-pleasing to God and that thus they will become righteous before God are features which, although we cannot set them aside, must remain subordinate to the leading idea of passionate ebullitions *in majorem gloriam Dei, i. e.*, here *justitiæ Dei*. Our translation would be more strongly expressed by the reading κατεργάζεται than by the better authenticated ἐργάζεται; but the latter taken in a pregnant sense, does also give the force of the former.

Shunning the temptation to unholy and hypocritical wrath (zeal) by means of true sanctification, negatively and positively.

VER. 21. **Wherefore removing** etc.—James bidding his readers purify themselves from the false zeal for their imaginary Jewish purity sounds like an oxymoron; for it is just their kind of zeal for purity which he characterizes as impurity and their imaginary piety as inhuman maliciousness. But true purifying is to him sanctification, that is, it is on the one hand the result of a negation (putting off impurity, etc.), and on the other, the result of a positive act, viz., the full receiving of the word of truth. However the two acts do not absolutely succeed one another (*remove* and *receive*), but with the removing of impurity (take note of the Participle) the real appropriating of the evangelical word of God is to take place. The negative element, however, has here a conditional precedence, repentance before faith (Mark i. 15); hence it is here subordinated by the Participle to the positive element on which it depends (cf. Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. iv. 22, 23). But the Participle must also be noted as enforcing constancy in purifying.—ἀποθέμενοι we cannot translate "*putting off*," for the reference is not figuratively to the putting off of filthy garments and to the opposite putting on of clean ones. The antithesis is: to remove, do away with; and to acquire, appropriate (see Eph. iv. 25 and other passages).

All filthiness (impurity).—ῥυπαρία (in the New Testament only here) is doubtless a stronger expression than ἀκαθαρσία (Rom. vi. 19). It denotes filth in a religious, theocratical sense like the filthy garment ch. ii. 2, like ῥύπος 1 Pet. iii. 21, and ῥυπαρός and ῥυπαρεύειν Rev. xxii. 11. To take the word in a general sense of *moral uncleanness* (Calvin and al.), is inadequate; still less apposite are the specific renderings "avarice" (Storr), "whoring" (Laurentius), "intemperance" (Heisen); but least of all its reduction to an attribute of the following κακία (Huther: putting off all uncleanness and abundance of malice; similarly Theile, Wiesinger and al.). It is sufficiently manifest that James sees in the carnal wrath (zeal) exerted in the interest of piety an antithesis, viz., impurity towards God (on the Atheistical in the heart of fanaticism see Nitzsch *System*, p. 39), and malice towards man.

All out-flowing (communication of life) **of malice.**—Huther: περισσεία, foreign to classical Greek, denotes in the New Testament "abundance," really superabundance. The substantive and the corresponding verb περισσεύειν signify in the New Testament the overflowing of a fulness of life, on the one hand as a development of life (a passing over into the life which continues to procreate itself Matth. v. 20; Rom. xv. 13, etc.), on the other hand as a communication of life (a passing over upon others, Rom. v. 15, 17; 2 Cor. viii. 2; ch. x. 15, etc.). Here the word is evidently used in the latter sense. This follows also from the proper definition of the term κακία, which here is not synonymous with πονηρία (1 Cor. v. 8)=*vitiositas* (Semler, Theile and al.), but according to the connection as the opposite of ἐν πραΰτητι, as Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8; Tit. iii. 3; 1 Pet. ii. 1. A more specific idea, namely the inimical disposition towards one's neighbour, which we express by "animosity" (Pott)! Huther.—(Wiesinger: ὀργή, Rosenmüller: *morositas;* Meyer: malice). The overflowing of maliciousness is therefore the malicious, hateful communication which passes from the fanatical wrath (zeal) of the propagandists on those whom they influence, according to Matth. xxiii. 15; Rom. ii. 24 and according to ecclesiastical history, especially the history of the persecution of the Donatists, the Paulicians and the Camisards, etc. The definition of περισσεία = περίσσωμα (Bede); outgrowth, efflorescence (Schneckenburger, de Wette):=the remnant surviving from former times (Gebser and al.=περίσσευμα), are thus set aside. [Alford joins ῥυπαρίαν with περισσείαν, as belonging to the Genitive κακίας and remarks that "it seems better for the context, which concerns not the putting away of moral pollution of all kinds, but only of that kind, which belongs to κακία. And thus taken it will mean that κακία pollutes the soul and renders it unfit to receive the ἔμφυτος λόγος. It is very possible that the agricultural similitude in ἔμφυτος may have influenced the choice of both these words, ῥυπαρία and περισσεία. The ground must be rid of all that pollutes and chokes it, before the seed can sink in and come to maturity; must be cleaned and cleared. περισσεία, if the above figures be allowed, is the rank growth, the abundant crop."—M.]

Receive (acquire, appropriate) **in meekness.**—*In* meekness, in virtue of a meek disposition, and not only with meekness. Meekness stands first in a pregnant sense. *In meekness acquire, i. e.* a meek demeanour, the opposite of wrathfulness, exhibited towards their brethren of different opinions is not only the condition, the vital element of the reception of the Gospel on the part of the Jews but also of the right appropriation of the same on the part of the Jewish Christians. Although the word denotes not directly the *docilis animus* (Grotius, similarly Calvin and al.), yet the first condition and proof of the same. The reference, to be sure, is not to meekness as the fruit of the reception of the word (Schneckenburger), although the morally calm and gentle spirit engendered under the influence of Christianity must be manifested in its highest perfection as its fruit. Want of meekness destroys the power of the Gospel (Matth.

xviii. 23, etc.); the fourth and the seventeenth centuries prove this in a remarkable manner *Receive.* δέξασθε is emphatic and denotes the right attitude under right hearing with right doing. The rooting and growing of Paul is here strikingly described as a fuller making one's own [appropriation], because the Jewish-Christians were in great danger of again losing their own (property) and the Jews were on the point of losing their ancient title to it (cf. 1 Thess. i. 6).

The word implanted in [and among] **you.**—This word is the objective Gospel (Huther: neither "innate or connate reason" [Oecumenius], nor the inner light of the mystics, for δέχεσθαι forbids that) as in v. 18, but in its subjective form of life, as the spiritual and vital principle in believers or as the seed of regeneration (1 Pet. i. 23). In this form it is implanted in believers but likewise implanted as a principle of conversion in the Jews as a whole; the latter meaning must not be not passed over. Hence the δέξασθε is relevant both with reference to the first reception and the further appropriation of it. In consequence of the difficulty arising from the idea of *receiving* a word already implanted, Calvin made ἔμφυτος proleptic and explained it "*ita suscipite, ut vere inseratur;*" and others similarly. But the word received subjectively does not thereby cease to be objective and to be received. [It is doubtful whether Lange's solution of the difficulty will stand the ordeal of logical analysis. There is no such double sense in ἔμφυτος. Nor is the more clearly expressed exposition of Alford more satisfactory. He sees in ἔμφυτος an allusion to the parable of the sower and makes "the λόγος ἔμφυτος=the word which has been sown, the word whose attribute and ἀρετή it is to be ἔμφυτος, and which is ἔμφυτος, awaiting your reception of it to spring up and take up your being into it and make you new plants." His exposition is open to the same objection that something which is already sown in *another* soil can be *implanted* in us, if he understands by λόγος ἔμφυτος the word *written* or *preached*. Adhering however to the real meaning ἔμφυτος=*innate*, τὸ ἐν φύσει (Hesych.) we may remove all difficulty. Then the λόγος ἔμφυτος is=the *innate Word*, that is, the *Word* which has been *born in our nature*, *i. e. Christ.* So Wordsworth who produces much illustrative matter of the use of ἔμφυτος and thus sums up the whole: While it is true, that Christ by his Incarnation is properly said to be ἔμφυτος *innate*, born in us, and to be indeed *Emmanuel*, *God with us*, *God manifest in our flesh*, God dwelling forever in the nature of us all; or, if we adopt the other sense of ἔμφυτος, while it is true, that Christ is indeed *grafted* in us as our *Netzer* or *Branch* (see Matth. ii. 23), yet will not this avail for our salvation, unless we *receive* Him by faith. We must be planted in Him and He in us by Baptism (Gal. iii. 27), we must *dwell* in Him and He in us, by actual and habitual communion with Him in the Holy Eucharist, we must abide and bring forth fruit in Him, by fervent love and hearty obedience. Christ, who is the Branch (Zech. vi. 12), is *engrafted* on the stock of our nature; but a scion grafted on a tree will *not grow* unless it is *received* and *take root* in the stock; so His Incarnation will profit us nothing, unless we *receive* Him in our hearts and drink in the sap of His grace and transfuse the life-blood of our wills into Him, and grow and coalesce with Him and bring forth fruit in Him."—M.].

Which is able to save your souls.—The idea of individual salvation is allied here with that of the national deliverance of the Israelites as in Jno. x. 28. Hence stress is here laid not only on the salvation of the soul but also on the salvation of the life and τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν is stronger than simply ὑμᾶς. [Alford says: "It is the ψυχή which carries the personality of the man; which is between the πνεῦμα drawing it upwards and the σάρξ drawing it downwards; and is saved or lost, passes into life or death, according to the choice between these two. And the λόγος ἔμφυτος, working through the πνεῦμα and by the Divine πνεῦμα, is a spiritual agency, able to save the ψυχή."—M.]. It is *able* (cf. Rom. i. 16, δύναμις θεοῦ), but you are unable, incompetent for the carrying out of your judaistic plans of salvation. [Calvin: "*Magnificum cœlestis doctrinæ encomium, quod certam ex ea salutem consequimur. Est autem additum, ut sermonem illum instar thesauri incomparabilis et expetere et amare et magnificare discamus. Est ergo acris ad castigandam nostram ignaviam stimulus, sermonem cui solemus tam negligenter aures præbere, salutis nostræ esse causam. Tametsi non in hunc finem servandi vis sermoni adscribitur quasi aut salus in externo vocis sonitu inclusa foret, aut servandi munus Deo ablatum alio transferretur. Nam de sermone tractat Jacobus qui fide in corda hominum penetravit: et tantum indicat, Deum salutis auctorem evangelio suo eam peragere.*"—M.].

But you will really appropriate the word by becoming doers of the word and by ceasing to remain hearers only, vv. 22–24.

Ver. 22. **But become ye doers of the word.**—γίνεσθε=*be* ye (Huther against Wiesinger, Theile and al.) who render=*become* ye. Huther refers to Matth. vi. 16; x. 16 and other passages. We take it with Wiesinger, of course not in the sense of Semler, as if the word indicated *perpetuam successionem horum exercitiorum*, but in the sense of a perfect development of their Christian life. This demand on the Jewish Christians and the Jews was the cause of the martyrdom of Simon, the brother of James under the reign of Trajan; it was also the cause of the early martyrdom of James, not long after he wrote this Epistle, and this is just his idea of the deed, the doing and the work, as it here for the first time takes a distinct shape: you must become wholly consistent Christians, if Christianity is to effect your salvation. As the warning against apostasy forms the negative side of his Epistle, so this exhortation to consistency constitutes its positive side. For the word is more clearly defined in vv. 18, 21 as the Gospel. They must become doers of the same in respect of its organic unity: this cannot be done by isolated acts, but only by one general act of practical life. Cf. ch. iv. 11; Rom. ii. 13. The ποιητής, who as such is the real ἀκροατής, is contrasted with the μόνον ἀκροατής. To the theocracy in its practical direction the ἀκροατής as such is insufficient, while the Greek school understood by ἀκροατής *per se* a praiseworthy hearer. Cf. Matth. vii. 21; Luke xi. 28; Jno. xiii. 17.

As those who ensnare themselves.—See v. 26; Col. ii. 4; Gal. vi. 3; 1 Jno. i. 8; *παραλογίζεσθαι*—to reckon beyond the mark, to reason falsely, to use fallacies,—in its practical tendency becomes deceiving, cheating and ensnaring by fallacies. Thus the "hearer only" deceives and ensnares himself. Huther refers *παραλογιζόμενοι* to *γίνεσθε* in opposition to Gebser and Schneckenburger who connect it with *ἀκροαταί*; but the latter are right, because the imaginary merit of *hearing* is the fallacy whereby they deceive themselves and thus properly ensnare themselves.

VER. 23. **For** [because] **if any is a hearer.**—Demonstration of the preceding by means of a simile, which is not, however, a mere figure.

Is like to.—The *οὗτος* emphatically repeated.

A man.—There must be some good reason for the recurrence of the specific *man* (sexual) and not only of man in general. Huther ought not to have despatched as *curious* the exposition [of Paes—M.] "*viri obiter tantum solent specula intueri*" [*muliebri autem est curiose se ad speculum componere.*—M.]. The exposition of the word *ἀνήρ* is connected with that of *κατανοεῖν* which according to Rosenmüller, Pott and al. is here used in the secondary sense of hasty observation, but is disputed by Wiesinger and Huther. Now it is correct that in Luke xii. 24, 27; Acts vii. 31, 32; xi. 6, the word denotes attentive contemplation or consideration. Primarily it signifies simply, to observe, perceive, contemplate, understand, and if the expression is opposed, as is the case here, by the more important contemplation *παρακύπτειν*, and we have in narrative form the statement, that the man observed himself, went away and forthwith forgot etc., the reference is only to a somewhat imperfect, momentarily-sufficient self-contemplating, such as before the mirror is rather peculiar to man than to woman. It is moreover to be borne in mind that the ideas "to hear the word," and "to contemplate oneself in a mirror" do not exactly coincide; it is only in the moment of a knowledge of oneself, of an incipient repentance that the word, which *per se* however is a mirror throughout, becomes efficient as a mirror. The *countenance* or *πρόσωπον*, although it need not denote the whole figure (so Pott and Schneckenburger), is not necessarily confined to the face (so Huther); the addition *τῆς γενέσεως* renders the word more expressive. *Γένεσις* denotes according to Wiesinger and Huther only the sphere of sensuous perception as distinguished from the ethical sphere, the face, such as a man has by natural birth. That is, James is again made to remind his readers that he only refers to a figure. We consider such an interposed explanation of the figure here also not only superfluous but inappropriate to symbolical diction. For what is the real meaning of *τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως* ch. iii. 6? According to Wiesinger, to be sure, "the wheel revolving from a man's birth;" but that would be an unintelligible expression and the exposition of Grotius and al. "*cursus naturæ*" has more in its favour. For life is also a genesis in a higher degree, and the fluctuating *πρόσωπον* is just the signature of the stages and states through which this genesis runs. This would also enable us to fix the reference of *αὐτοῦ* here to *γένεσις* (Huther), as opposed to its reference to the general idea (Wiesinger). The Jews, as Jewish-Christians, for a while attained self-knowledge, in that they saw [knew, recognized—M.] themselves in the mirror of the Gospel according to their national and individual course of development, and thus they saw also the *maculas* of this development and appearance, hence the allusion to this circumstance (Wolf) must not be rejected with Huther. In a more general sense, *πρόσωπον* etc., can neither denote the natural corruption of man *per se* (Pott), nor the ideal form of the new man (Wiesinger). To stop at the figure itself (with Huther) would be tantamount to making the figure unmeaning. But it simply signifies the image of the inner man's appearance as to his sinful condition modified now this way, now that way by his actual conduct. On the mirrors of the ancients see the respective article in Winer.

VER. 24. **For he observed himself.**—The narrative form represents as in v. 11, an incident quickly accomplished in the rapid succession of the fleeting stages of its brief duration. The *εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο* is the most important point, as Huther remarks, but each separate stage has a meaning of its own. The stage of self-knowledge in the mirror of the word, believing hearing, is followed by speedy departing, the averting of the mind from the objective fulness and depth of the word (not only from what had been heard subjectively, as Huther explains); the departing is attended by the forgetting of the mirror-image, *i. e.*, the loss of self-knowledge conscious of the necessity of salvation which would have impelled the man to the consequence of Christian renovation of life. The loss accruing from such a course, is referred to by James in v. 26, but especially in ch. v. [The Perfect *ἀπελήλυθεν* standing between the Aorists *κατενόησεν* and *ἐπελάθετο* is striking and imports that the *departing* denotes a permanent neglect and disuse of the mirror.—M.].

The real doer of the word according to his marks of distinction: his being absorbed in the contemplation of the free-making word, his constancy, the blessedness.

VER. 25. **But he who became absorbed.**—The pure antithesis of the former figure. Huther: "*παρακύψας* corresponds with *κατενόησεν*, *παραμείνας* with *ἀπελήλυθεν*, and *οὐκ ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς* with *ἐπελάθετο*." The Participles have the effect of strengthening the already strong expressions, especially in the Aorist, while taken together they indicate: *γενόμενος*, that it is only by constancy that a man becomes a real doer of the word. This passage must not be construed as if James wanted to distinguish the doing of the word as something separate from the looking into and abiding in it. The *παρακύψας* and *παραμείνας*, as such, is *ποιητὴς ἔργου γενόμενος*. This has an important bearing on the right understanding of the passage and is also very—Pauline. Constant looking into the word of salvation by faith is preëminently *the* doing which is followed by outward proof. This construction therefore must not be altered by resolving *γενόμενος* into *γίνεται* (Pott), or by saying with Wiesinger that right hearing and appropriating leads to doing and (thereby) to the blessedness of doing. Even Huther, who rejects Wiesinger's exposition, does not strictly adhere to the full energy

of the idea, for he says that the doing of the law is the necessary consequence of persevering looking into the same; although prominence must be given to the fact that he characterizes the consequence as *necessary*.—Παρακύπτειν to stoop aside, to stoop over a thing in order to examine it closely (Luke xxiv. 12; Jno. xx. 5, 11; 1 Pet. i. 12); to sink into it, to be absorbed in its contemplation. Schneckenburger thinks: perhaps *ad imaginem speculi humi aut mensæ impositi adaptatum*. But this is not the most fitting way to look into a mirror. The remaining, persevering in it, Wiesinger explains as appropriating. But it is just the remaining in the yielding oneself to the object by contemplating it, whereby the appropriating of it is effected. [One of the best illustrations of the force of παρακύψας is given by Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, p. 15, *note:* "It signifies the incurvation or bending of the body in the act of *looking down into;* as, for instance, in the endeavour to see the reflected image of a star in the water at the bottom of a well. A more happy and forcible word could not have been chosen to express the nature and ultimate object of reflection and to enforce the necessity of it, in order to discover the living fountain and spring-head of the evidence of the Christian faith in the believer himself, and at the same time to point out the seat and region where alone it is to be found. *Quantum sumus scimus.* That which we find within ourselves, which is more than ourselves, and yet the ground of whatever is good and permanent therein, is the substance and life of all other knowledge."—M.].

Into the completed law.—We translate *completed* because of the weighty adjective τέλειος, which here again makes prominent the N. T. completion of the O. T. (cf. the τέλειοι and the ἔργον τέλειον v. 4, and the ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα, v. 7; the Sermon on the Mount, the πληροῦν Matth. ii., etc.). It is not therefore the *lex naturalis* (Schulthess), or in general the λόγος ἀληθείας, inasmuch as it is the means of regeneration and the norm of the new life (Wiesinger, Huther: the norm of the new life), or on the one hand the O. T. law as simply perfect, or on the other the Gospel in a general sense; but it is the Gospel conceived as that completion of the law which transforms the outward, enslaving law into a new principle of life communicating itself to the inner man and absolutely liberating him. And just as the expressions of Paul: the law of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 2), the law of faith (Rom. iii. 27), always contain an oxymoron alluding to the higher unity of the antithesis: law and spirit, etc., so likewise in the expressions of James: the perfect law, the law of liberty, although an imitation of Pauline modes of expression is out of the question (Kern). The law as law made men servants (slaves); in its N. T. completion it makes them free. In the same sense it is also called the νόμος βασιλικός which is fulfilled by love (ch. ii. 8), and again the law of liberty (v. 12). The passages of the Old Testament, which speak of the glory of the law (Deut. xxxiii. 2, 3), or of its sweetness (Ps. xix. 8), denote the prophetical transition from the Sinaitical standpoint to the Evangelical, which was decidedly foretold by the prophets (Jer. xxxi. 33). Those who attribute to James an Ebionite glorification of the law, put him back behind Jeremiah or rather remove him even out of the Old Testament. But James had special reasons for calling the Gospel a law of (liberating) liberty inasmuch as his people were tempted to seek in their O. T. zeal for the law the means of chiliastico-revolutionary liberation (cf. Jno. viii. 32, etc.). The Gospel is moreover a law of liberty in that it asserts, along with the Christian's liberty of faith, the liberty of conscience of those of a different mind and in this form also breaks the fetters of fanaticism.

Not a hearer unto forgetting.—Properly a hearer of forgetfulness (ἐπιλησμονῆς, ἅπαξ λεγ. in the N. T.), stronger than a forgetful hearer. The antithesis ποιητὴς ἔργου brings out the idea that forgetfulness was, as it were, the object of hearing ("*in futuram oblivionem*"). The expression "doer of the work" (as follows from the construction as stated above) cannot signify here a work-activity separated from, or only clearly distinguished from faith, but it denotes the perseverance of the life of faith, which owing to its oneness of energy leads of its own accord to a consistent exhibition of corresponding outward deeds.

The same shall be blessed.—See the beatitude v. 12.

In his doing,—(ποίησις in the N. T. ἅπαξ λεγόμ., occurs only, besides here, in Sir. xix. 20), not in his deed. In the ever diligent (efficient) energy which is the soul of his deeds. Schneckenburger: "*ut ipsa actio sit beatitudo.*"—The *striving* spiritual life-motion or the doing becomes a *festive* spiritual life-motion, perfect joy. This factual becoming blessed lies according to circumstances in confession, and Rom. x. 9, 10 exhibits a near affinity with this passage. It is noteworthy that Paul also in that passage was particularly referring to Jewish Christians and that James above all things felt anxious that the Jews should confess Christ and that the Jewish Christians should make full and common cause with their Gentile brethren.

False and true religious service or zeal for religion and the glory of God. vv. 26, 27.

VER. 26. **If any man fancieth himself.**—Δοκεῖν denotes primarily to suppose with reference to appearance and without any higher ground of certainty (Matth. xxiv. 44; hence 1 Cor. vii. 40, an expression of modesty), hence according to the connection also to imagine erroneously (Matth. vi. 7) or as here to be spiritually conceited, [*i. e.*, the man thinks, fancies that he *is* religious.—M.].

To be a religious man.—Θρῆσκος is peculiar to James. The sense of the adjective is clear from Acts xxvi. 5 and Col. ii. 18. James has formed the adjective in a masterly manner: one who plumes himself (seeks his being in) on his pretended serving of God. The word certainly implies the exhibition of a presumed εὐσέβεια in external acts of religious worship (Huther), not exclusively however in the outward observance of religion, but in the permanent soldier- or knight-service for the glory of God. So the Jews supposed that they were *the* servants of God among the nations (Rom. ii. 17), so did the Mohammedans and Crusaders at a later period and so the Jesuits suppose now. But at that time the

Jewish Christians, conceited of their God-serving, in various ways separated themselves from intercourse with Gentile Christians and in preparing for the Jewish war, the Jews supposed they were making ready for "the glory of God." [There is no one word in English which gives the exact meaning of ϑρῆσκος and ϑρησκεία. The words *religious* and *religion* at one time were used in the sense of outward ceremonial worship. An example from Milton and another from the Homilies may prove serviceable. Some of the heathen idolatries Milton characterizes as being

——"adorned
With gay *religions* full of pomp and gold."
Par. Lost. 61.

"Images used for no *religion*, or superstition rather, we mean of none worshipped, nor in danger to be worshipped of any, may be suffered." *Homily against Peril of Idolatry.* See Trench, *Synonymns of the N. T.*, p. 233. *A propos* of this θρησκεία, Coleridge (*Aids to Reflection*, p. 14) has these beautiful remarks: "The outward service of ancient religion, the rites, ceremonies and ceremonial vestments of the old law, had morality for their substance. They were the letter, of which morality was the spirit: the enigma, of which morality was the meaning. But morality itself is the service and ceremonial (*cultus exterior*, θρησκεία) of the Christian religion. The scheme of truth and grace that became (ἐγένετο) through Jesus Christ, the faith that looks down into the perfect law of liberty, has *light for its garment:* its very *robe is righteousness.*" —M.].

Not bridling his tongue.—Not *exempli causa* (Rosenmüller); nor must we with the majority of commentators resolve the Participle into "although," as Huther rightly remarks, adding: "James wants to censure those to whom zeal in talking was a sign of ϑρησκεία." That is: those who by their fanatical zeal wanted to make good their pretensions of being the true soldiers of God. Χαλιναγωγεῖν, an expression found only in profane authors of the later period has been added by James to the fund of N. T. language (cf. Acts. iii. 2).

But deceiving his heart.—Ἀπατῶν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ is not exactly synonymous with παραλογίζεσϑαι ἑαυτόν (Huther), but denotes the same act of self-deception in a much higher degree. From the inward self-deceit of the thoughts protrudes false zeal and this has the effect that the zealot completely deceives his heart by false self-excitement (*échauffement* and bad consequences). The fanatic, by false exaggerations outwardly, at last makes himself inwardly a false and bad character.

His religion (in the sense as defined above, his zeal for the imaginary cause of God) **is vain.**—The blinding effects of his blinding passion yield no fruit of blessing to himself and others and pass as follies (*Quixotisms* in a higher style) from history into the judgment.

Ver. 27. **Religion pure and unprofaned.**—The two adjectives are not strictly synonymous (Theile, Huther), nor do they simply denote the contrast of the outward and the inward (Wiesinger and al.). The expression "*pure*" requires the Christian realization of the symbolical, theocratical purity; the sequel shows that it is to exhibit itself in the pious life of merciful love. The expression "*unprofaned*" (we supply this rendering in order to give more marked force to its literal meaning; the difference between ἀμίαντος and ἄσπιλος also must be brought out in the translation) requires in the same sense real preservation of purity and purifying. The legal Jew became unclean by natural and pagan uncleannesses, the Christian must keep himself clean and cleanse himself from worldly-mindedness and vain worldly doings. Such a Divine service, therefore, denotes here the true life and work for the glory of God.—

Before the God and Father.—This again lays stress on the Christian conception of God, as in vv. 5, 17 and παρὰ τῷ ϑεῷ refers not only to the Divine judgment (Huther) but more especially to the attitude of the servant before the face and mouth of the commanding Lord. (Huther rightly observes concerning καὶ πατρί "God in virtue of His love can only consider *pure* that religious service which is the expression of love." [Chrysostom in *Catena* says: οὐκ εἶπεν ἐὰν νηστεύητε, ὅμοιοι ἐστὲ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν, οὐδὲν γὰρ τούτων παρὰ ϑεὸν οὐδὲ ἐργάζεταί τι τούτων ὁ ϑεός· ἀλλὰ τί; γίνεσϑε οἰκτιρμονες ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· τοῦτο ϑεοῦ ἔργον· ἐὰν οὖν τοῦτο μὴ ἔχῃς, τί ἔχεις; ἔλεον ϑέλω, φησί, καὶ οὐ ϑυσίαν.—M.].

To be careful of the orphans and widows.—We translate thus because it brings out the antithesis *to be careful of worldly affairs*, which James has doubtless before his mind's eye, like Peter in his ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος, 1 Pet. iv. 15. Although the verb is frequently applied to visiting the distressed (Huther: Matth. xxv. 36, 43; Jer. xxiii. 2 etc.), it has also in this form a wider meaning (Theile: the *species pro genere*). The wider sense: to be careful of, to care for, to protect one, is directly brought out in Acts. xv. 14; Heb. ii. 6 and elsewhere; Philo calls ἐπίσκεψις *providentia.* "The ὀρφανοί are named first as those in want of help, as in Deut. x. 18; Job xxix. 12, 13 etc." Huther. This Divine service answers to the fatherhood of God; those who engage in it do His work in love and compassion, because He is a Father of the orphans and a Judge (a Protector of the rights of) the widows, Ps. lxviii. 6 and other passages. Now according to the book of Tobit it was the ideal of a true Israelite to protect the distressed among the captives of his people and Tobit i. 6, 7 we read that it was an integral part of the religious service of Tobit that every third year he gave the tithe to the strangers, the widows and the fatherless. In this manner the Israelite of the New Testament was called upon to help his poor people especially the distressed in their affliction. The state of affliction in its concrete form is most frequently and most touchingly exhibited in the distress of widows and orphans. In this direction we may have to seek the sense of keeping oneself unspotted from the world; and this probably explains the asyndeton of the two sentences (cf. Huther). They are not strictly coördinate, but the second is the reverse or the sequence of the first, its pure antithesis. Hence ἄσπιλον comes emphatically first. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 14. The expression ought really to be resolved

into two ideas, firstly, to keep oneself from the world, secondly to keep oneself unspotted from the world, that is, *from the world* is connected with the two elements of the sentence: to keep oneself unspotted. The ethical idea of *κόσμος* is everywhere the personal totality of life converted into the Impersonal, *i. e.* mankind as to its ungodly bias. The peculiarity of this idea in James comes out more clearly in ch. iv. 4. What heathenism was to the Jew, the antithesis of the holy people, to which it might apostatize by spiritual idolatry, such was to the apostolical mind, the ungodly doing of the world, whether manifested in Judaistic visionariness or in a heathen form. Oecumenius's idea of the *δημώδης καὶ συρφετὸς ὄχλος, ὁ κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης αὐτοῦ φθειρόμενος* was consequently not far from the image of the excited condition of the world, which was floating before the Apostle's imagination; but the Judaistic *ὄχλος* assumed a prouder and more spiritual shape. This specific reference, of course does not exclude the more general. [Alford: "*The whole earthly creation*, separated from God and lying in the sin, which, whether considered as consisting in the men who serve it, or the enticements which it holds out to evil lust (*ἐπιθυμία*) is to Christians a source of continual defilement."—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The purity of the moral teaching of James also is conclusive from what he says concerning *wrath*. James is far from holding a quietistic or ascetico-rigoristic view which did approve of all anger absolutely, as unworthy of man or the Christian. He recognizes with Christ (Matth. v. 22; Mark. iii. 5) and Paul (Eph. iv. 26) lawful anger as opposed to unlawful. As in the case of the Master, so also in that of the disciple anger should be the extreme point of the flame, with which love strikes. But although anger is permitted up to a certain degree, it is nevertheless restricted within fixed limits by the limiting direction *βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν*. One has only to look at the deplorable mischief that may be produced by excessive anger in order fully to justify the necessity and wisdom of this precept. Peculiarly Christian is the *triplex officium*, which in v. 19 is commanded in so brief and pithy a manner. The exhibition of such a frame of mind affords proof that the regeneration spoken of in v. 18 is a reality. The natural man is the very opposite: he is slow to hear, swift to speak and swift to wrath. It is also note worthy that v. 19 contains properly the *text*, the exposition and developement of which are treated of in the remainder of the Epistle. The exhortation to be *swift to hear* is expounded from v. 21—ch. ii. 26 with simultaneous reference to a fruitful hearing; the admonition to be *slow to speak* is emphatically urged in ch. iii. and that to be slow to wrath in ch. iv. and v.

2. Because on the Israelite standpoint no justification before God was possible without the fulfilling of the law, the chief demand of which is *love*, while wrath is the very expression of the most unbridled *selfishness*, there are no ideas more decidedly opposed to one another than *ὀργὴ ἀνδρός* and *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*.

3. Slowness of hearing was, it would seem, an evil not peculiar to the first readers of this Epistle, but also common to others, and particularly to Jewish Christians. Cf. Heb. v. 11; x. 25. The emphatic urging of the opposite quality is therefore not superfluous. Here also the words of James echo the words of Christ. Luke xi. 28; Matth. vii. 24–27; xiii. 23.

4. Real *inward* hearing is ever to receive anew the word, implanted and already extant within us as the seed of regeneration, which in an inexhaustible richness of forms is ever brought home to us as a new word of life. What would the preached word avail unless it had hidden points of contact in the hearts and consciences of Christians? cf. 1 Thess. i. 6. The forgetful hearer, whom James describes in vv. 22–24 fully corresponds with the second class of men depicted by our Lord in the parable of the sower (Matth. xiii. 20, 21).

5. James' view of the connection of faith and hearing is identical with that of Paul. Rom. x. 14–17.

6. The representation of the Gospel as *the perfect law of liberty* is as correct as it is important. Paul, who contrasts generally the law and the Gospel, acknowledges a law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, Rom. viii. 2. This law is *perfect* because it presents at once the most perfect and most judicious directory of the life of believers; it is the *law of liberty* because the faithful practice of it leads men to true, moral liberty. Here the saying is fully valid *legum servi sumus est liberi esse possimus*. Cf. Jno. viii. 36; Matth. v. 17–20.

7. Care must be had that James be not misunderstood in the description of the pure and unspotted religious service (v. 23), as if these words contained an exact definition of the inner side of true religious service in general. Any one somewhat philanthropically inclined and at the same time keeping himself outwardly free from worldly contamination is on that account far from being entitled to say that in so doing he is practising the pure and unspotted religious service in the sense of James. In order to prevent any possible misapprehension of his language we have to notice that he refers not indefinitely to *the* Divine service, but to *a* pure and unspotted service (*θρησκεία* without the Article) and states merely in a general way what is above all things essential to the being and efficacy of a practical religiousness in its outward manifestation. "As if one addicted to drink were to boast of his morality and were to be told in reply that a moral man does not get drunk, it would not be the latter's purpose to represent thereby the sum-total of a Christian conversation." *Chrysostom*. The great and principal condition is taken for granted, viz.: repentance and faith; besides, this exhortation is also addressed to Christians already regenerate, v. 18. James insists upon the duty we owe to our *neighbour*, who is here represented by widows and orphans as those most in want of help, and upon the duties we owe to *ourselves* by the practice of self-denial and vigilance. These two points reveal at the same time the true disposition toward God. Besides James does not say that the man who applies himself to the discharge of these duties shall be blessed *by* this his

doing but that he shall have even here a taste of bliss *in* this his doing (ἐν τῇ ποιήσει) so that this doing as such is to him the highest bliss. v. Gerlach: "In this doing of the law he will feel himself truly blessed, as he must be esteemed blessed. To fulfil the commandments of God, to progress in holiness, is an ever-growing enjoyment of blessedness, granted more and more to the believer and the faithful already here on earth."

8. Widows and orphans so highly favoured even by the Mosaic law (Ex. xxii. 22–24 and elsewhere), are also emphatically protected by Christian morality. The difference between the philanthropy of the Church and that of a mere humanism.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christians are called constantly to adopt the prayer of David, Ps. cxli. 3.—It is impossible that the bitter root of wrath can produce the sweet fruit of righteousness.—Difference between holy and unholy anger.—*Ira furor brevis*.—The causes and excuses of the frequent dulness of hearing.—The development of spiritual life ever conditioned by the use of the means of grace.—The preaching of the Gospel a constant watering of the seed of regeneration already planted in us.—What we have to lay aside and what we have to bring with us in order to serve God in public (*i. e.* make a public profession of religion).—Many hearers put rigorous demands on the preacher but hardly any on themselves; it ought to be the reverse.—True meeekness in the hearing of the word.—The Gospel a power of God unto salvation etc. Rom. i. 16.—The self-deception of the hearer of the word who becomes not a doer, cf. Prov. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. iii. 18.—Three classes of men: 1, those who neither hear nor do the word; 2, those who hear it but do it not; 3, those who both hear and do it.—Even Herod heard John the Baptist gladly and for his sake did many things, but not the one thing needful, Mark vi. 20.—The word of God a bright mirror which must be attentively looked into, would we attain true self-knowledge. The true hearer of the Gospel looks as carefully into the mirror as do the angels into the plan of salvation, 1 Pet. i. 12.—The Gospel 1, a law; 2, a perfect law; 3, a perfect law of liberty.—The blessedness of the doer of the word, Ps. cxix. 1 etc.—The absolute incompatibility of the service of sins of the tongue with a truly religious life.—The Christian life a service of love.—Only that Divine service is the true, which is a Divine service before "God and the Father," 1 Sam. xvi. 7.—The practice of the duties of love must be joined with conscientious watchfulness of ourselves.—The Christian's relation to the world: 1, to its distressed ones; 2, to its temptations.—The fruit of righteousness is a tree of life, Prov. xi. 30.—How eloquently James has recommended his instruction concerning active fear of God by his own example.—(vv. 19–27). A direction for and eulogy of the right hearing of the Gospel. James urges us 1, to devout hearing (vv. 19, 20), 2, to meek receiving (v. 21), 3, to active practice (vv. 22–24), and 4, to constant searching of the word (vv. 25–27).—(vv. 25-27) 1, What one enjoys (v. 25), 2, avoids (v. 26), and 3, practises in the way of active piety.—True Christianity the most practical matter in the world.

STARKE:—Believers are more eager to learn than to teach, for the cause of regeneration makes us real hearers of the word. Jno. viii. 47.

LUTHER:—Blessed is the man whose mouth is in his heart and whose heart is not in his mouth; the one is wisdom, the other folly.

STARKE:—He who along with other sins does not overcome his carnal anger, cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, Gal. v. 20, 21.—Sins are also in believers, who must more and more cleanse themselves from them, Heb. xii. 1.

QUESNEL:—He only loves the word of God in truth, who performs it by love, 1 Jno. v. 3.

LANGII OP:—To deceive others is bad, to deceive oneself worse, and the latter is more common than the first, Prov. xxiv. 8.

STARKE:—The word of God is here compared with a mirror not only on account of its intrinsic brightness and purity, but chiefly because of its use and benefit. For it not only shows us (according to the law) the detestable and sinful form of our souls which we derive from the first Adam and wherein alas, we resemble Satan, but it shows us also (according to the Gospel) the beauteous, glorious and lovely form which we may receive from Christ, the second Adam, and His Spirit by means of the new birth and wherein we resemble Him.

QUESNEL:—He that doeth not what he heareth, forgetteth more than he heareth and his latter end will be worse than the beginning, 2 Pet. ii. 20, 22.—Blessed is the man who receives his own testimony against himself. 1 Cor. xi. 31.

STARKE:—Fear not, believers, if you hear the Gospel called a law and that it enters as much and more into hearts of poor sinners with lightning and thunder than the old law of Sinai; for it is a law of liberty. Such a liberty which is more valuable than all treasures, more pleasant than life itself and more precious than all the goods of the world; none know what it is worth but those who have lost it and those who have it, although they esteem it most highly, yet do they not esteem it according to its value, Gal. v. 1–13.—Whoso truly serves God in the spirit, his tongue also is governed by the Spirit of God, Ps. xxxix. 2.—Many whose mouth is full of the praise of the truth and who are proud of their Divine service are their own worst deceivers and seducers, Rom. ii. 23.—Many a service is well-pleasing to God which is despised and even rejected by men, Acts xxiv. 14.

CRAMER:—Widows and orphans are privileged individuals before God.—He that keeps himself unspotted before the world, does the will of God and is greatly blessed, 2 Cor. vi. 17, 18.

Vv. 16–21. *Epistle for the 4th Sunday after Easter* (Cantate).

LUTHER:—Because the Epistle of James ch. i. has been read from of old on this Sunday, being also good for instruction and exhortation, we will also retain it for those who would have it continued and say something concerning it, lest it be thought we wanted to reject it, although the Epistle has not been written by an Apostle nor does set forth everywhere the manner and stamp of apostolical teaching nor quite conformable to pure doctrine. Therefore James concludes:

"Let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath." That is: be taught, admonished by God's word, reproved and comforted, be swift in these things; but be not fluent in speech, in murmuring, cursing and railing against God and man. Hereby he does not forbid us all speaking, reproving and being angry, if the commandment of God or necessity require us so to do, but that we for ourselves shall not rashly and vehemently engage in it, although we be irritated thereto—and the rather hearken to and suffer us to be taught by the word; which is the true and real word, which we should ever let govern and lead us, and from which should flow whatsoever we say, blame and rebuke. Hence it is said soon afterwards to receive the word with meekness, that we may not be angry if it reprove us, or murmur if we have to suffer somewhat for it.

Heubner:—Talkativeness the mark of a weak mind.—The word of God the best bridle for the government of the tongue and the affections.—Never act while thou art angry.—(vv. 16–21.) The Christian's belief in the presiding control of an all-good God. 1. Nature and reason, 2. Effects of this belief.—Self-deceit in the service of God.

Porubszky:—Of ungodly anger. 1. What is anger? 2. What does anger? 3. How is anger conquered?

Couard:—Contemplations on the precious gift of the Gospel.

Kapff:—Whereto we are impelled by the absolute perfection of God.

Palmer:—Good works: 1, their inward origin (vv. 16–18), 2, their outward form (vv. 19–21).

Souchon:—Receive the word daily.

Standt:—What we may expect from God: 1, what He gives (vv. 16–18), 2, what He removes (vv. 19–21).

Von Harless:—Who walks in the right way to the end of life?

Arndt:—The sins of the tongue.

Herberger:—Like as a wagon runs in two ruts, like as a man stands on two legs unless he be a cripple, like as he consists of two parts, body and soul, so Christianity also runs in two parts, in faith and works. 1. God the good gives good gifts, 2, and expects good to be returned to Him.

Lisco:—The fountain and the vessel of all good gifts.—Spring's threefold address to us the children of God.—The holiness of God in its incompatibility with human sin.

Fuchs:—The word of truth as the perfect gift of God.

Vv. 22–27. *Epistle for 5th Sunday after Easter* (Rogate).

Heubner:—Other laws bind and are often burdensome to us: the law of God delivers us from the bands of sin.—Those, otherwise free from gross sins, yet sin with the tongue.—Sefishness turns even religion into an instrument of self-sufficiency.—All religion must be moral.—We should take to the necessitous not only our gifts but ourselves.—Comparison of the true and false religious service as to 1, their nature, 2, their influence and 3, their relation to God.—Caution against the abuse of the doctrine of justifying faith.

Porubszky:—Be doers of the word and not hearers only!—Our Divine service is a surrender to God.

Löhe:—There is no doer but is also a true hearer. First a hearer, then a doer; true hearers, true doers.

Lange:—If the word seizes not thyself, it will be a burden to thy head.

Stier: v. 27.—He refers less to the work itself than to the disposition and impulse of heart which impels us to the distressed in their affliction. Hence he says nothing of our feeding, clothing and providing for widows and orphans, but he specifies our visiting them in their affliction, protecting them, assisting them and carrying to them the best of our possessions, true consolation. We understand, it is to be hoped, how much this requires, how the duty of love drives us constantly into the world and among men, and how it is incompatible with pharisaic or pietistic separateness and monkish solitariness.—How the hearing of the word is to become saving work.

Von Kapff:—Who is blessed in his doing?

Florey:—How differently Christians use the mirror of the Divine Word!

Schmid:—The apothegm of wisdom concerning self-vigilance: 1. Mirror aright and see thyself; 2. See aright and know thyself; 3. Know (thyself) aright and think thee small; 4. Who thinks him (self) small is wise in all.

Herberger:—The keeping of God's word makes it ours unto salvation.

Couard:—Caution against self-deceit in Christianity.

Souchon:—Be doers of the word.

Westermaier:—The same.

J. Saurin:—An excellent sermon on v. 25, entitled: *Sur la manière d'étudier la Religion*, Serm. Tom. iv. p. 1–48.

Lisco:—Of true religion.—Be doers of the word and not hearers only. 1. *When* we shall be it? and 2, *Whereby* is it seen that we are it.—Of the nature of true religion.

Ledderhose:—The right hearing of the word.

Neiling:—Ye shall be not only hearers of the word, but doers also [in a rhyme which hardly deserves reproduction.—M.].

[This section is already so full of homiletical matter that instead of supplying additional ones, I refer the reader to the *new* matter given under "Exegetical and Critical" and to the following standard works which will furnish him with much that is excellent and full of thought.

On verse 22. The Sermon of Bp. Andrews, V. p. 195; also Bp. Sanderson, III. p. 366.

On verse 26. Bp. Butler's Sermon IV.; Dr. Barrow, Serm. XIII., Vol. I. p. 283.—M.]

V. THIRD ADMONITION WITH REFERENCE TO THE THIRD FORM OF TEMPTATION. EBIONITE CONDUCT.

CAUTION AGAINST JUDAISTIC PARTIALITY, AGAINST FAVOURING THE RICH (THE JUDAIZING CHRISTIAN) AND DEPRECIATING THE POOR (THE GENTILE CHRISTIAN) IN THEIR CHURCH-LIFE. CONSISTENT PROOF OF FAITH DEMANDED IN THE WORK OF CHRISTIAN BROTHERLY LOVE AND IN THE ACKNOWLEDGING OF UNITY OF FAITH IN THE FAITH-WORK OF ABRAHAM THE PATRIARCH AND IN THE FAITH-WORK OF RAHAB, THE GENTILE HARLOT. DEAD AND LIVING FAITH.

Chapter II.

My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, *the Lord* of glory, with
2 respect of persons. For if there come unto your assembly[1] a man with a gold ring,[2]
3 in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment: And ye have[3]
respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him,[4] Sit thou here in a
good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here[5] under my footstool:
4 [6]Are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?
5 Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world,[7] rich in
faith, and heirs of the kingdom[8] which he hath promised to them that love him?
6 But ye have despised the poor. Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you[9] before
7 the judgment seats? Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye
8 are called? If ye fulfil the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy
9 neighbour as thyself, ye do well: But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin,
10 and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall[10] keep the whole
11 law, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit
adultery,[11] said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill,
12 thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall
13 be judged by the law of liberty. For he shall have judgment without mercy,[12] that
14 hath shewed no mercy; and[13] mercy rejoiceth against judgment. What *doth it*
profit,[14] my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can
15 faith save him? [15]If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute[16] of daily food,
16 And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be *ye* warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what
17 *doth it* profit? Even so faith,[17] if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.
18 Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without[18]
19 thy[19] works, and I will shew thee[20] my faith by my[21] works. Thou believest[22] that
20 there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble. But wilt
21 thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?[23] Was not Abraham our
22 father justified by works, when he offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou
23 how faith wrought with[24] his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the
Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto
24 him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then[25] how that
25 by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. Likewise also was not Rahab the
harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers,[26] and had sent *them*
26 out another way? For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without[27] works
is dead also.

Verse 1. Lange: My brethren, do not practise the faith in our Lord Jesus, the Christ of glory [the Messiah in His glory exalted above Judaistic expectations] with respectings of persons [personal considerations, partialities.]

[. . . . . hold not ye the faith . . . . [the Lord] of glory in respecting of persons.—M]

Verse 2. [1] εἰς τὴν. A. G. K., Tischendorf; omit τὴν B. C. Sin. al. Lachmann [Alford—M.], an important variation, showing that the reference is not to particular synagogues.

[[2] χρυσοδακτύλιος=golden-ringed.—M.]

Lange: For if there had entered into your common assembly (συναγωγή) a man with a gold finger-ring, in a clean splendid garment, but there had also entered a poor man in an unclean garment.

[For if there come into your place of assembly a man with golden rings, etc.—M.]

Verse 3. [3] ἐπιβλέψητε δὲ. B. C. K. Tischendorf [Alford], is more expressive than καὶ ἐπιβλέψητε A. G. Lachmann.

[4] The omission of αὐτῷ A. B. C. Sinait. keeps the expression more general and gives it more dogmatical colouring [than its insertion, Rec. K. L. Vulg. and al.—M.]

[5] ὧδε inserted in C.** G. K., is omitted by A. B. C.*—The addition of τῶν ποδῶν in A. Vulg. [Syr.—M]. Lachmann, seems to be exegetical and intensive, but may have been dropped owing to a moderation in expression.

Lange: And ye were looking upon [made a looking up, a demonstration of] him who wore the clean splendid garment and should say [to him] [thou], sit thou here on the best place, but should say to the poor, [thou] keep standing here [on the standing place], or sit [here] under [down at] my footstool.

Verse 4. [6] καὶ omitted before οὐ by A. B. C. Sinait, may have been objected to in the apodosis as a striking form,

Lange: Did ye not then separate [divide] among ourselves, and become judges according to evil considerations?

[Did ye not distinguish (invidiously) among ourselves etc.—M.]

Verse 5. [7] Rec. reads τοῦ κόσμου τούτου; [A.** C.** K. L. τοῦ κόσμου—M.]; τῷ κόσμῳ A.* B. C.* Sin. etc. The variations seem to be exegetical illustrations.

[8] For βασιλείας [A. and] Sin.; read ἐπαγγελίας.

Lange: .... hath not God also chosen the poor [according to the world), who are rich in faith, heirs of the [glorified Messiah—] kingdom ......

Verse 6. [[9] For ὑμῶν A. Sinait, read ὑμᾶς.—M.]

Lange: .... [But] is it not the rich who oppress you? Is it not just they, who drag you to the courts of judgment?

[Is it not they that drag you into courts of justice?—M.]

Verse 7. Lange: Is it not just they who blaspheme that fair [glorious] name, which hath been made to you a surname?

[.... that glorious name, which was invoked over you?—M.]

Verse 8. Lange: If indeed ye fulfil [complete under the New Testament] the royal law [the law of the kingdom] according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye act beautifully [conformable to the beautiful name of Christ as Christians].

[If, however, ye fulfil etc.—M.]

Verse 9. Lange: But if ye practise respect of persons, ye practise sin, convicted by the [very] law as transgressors.

[But if ye respect persons, ye work sin, being convicted by the law as transgressors.—M.]

Verse 10. [10] τηρήσῃ and πταίσῃ, the most authentic readings. So [A. B. C. Sinait.—M] Lachmann, Tischendorf.

Lange: For whosoever should observe .... in one thing [commandment] the same hath become guilty of all.

[For whosoever shall have kept etc.—M.]

Verse 11. [11] A. B. C. Sin. have the Present μοιχεύεις, φονεύεις.

Verse 12. [... as those about to be judged by the law of liberty.—M.]

Verse 13. [12] ἀνέλεος not ἀνίλεως, is the true reading. So A. B. C. [K. Alford—M.] Lach., Tisch. On the form, itself and variations of spelling it see Huther.

[13] καὶ before κατακαυχ, found only in minuscule codd; δὲ after κατακαυχ, is probably also a stylistic insertion; the variations κατακαυχάσθω in A. [Vulg.;—χασθε C.** M.];—χᾶτε are exegetical efforts to render the text more easy.—ἔλεος instead of ἔλεον supported by A. B. Tischend. [Alford.—M.]

Lange: For the judgment is merciless to him who did not practise mercy, and mercy boasteth [triumphantly] against the judgment [thus Christian mercy triumphantly excels the judging legalistic spirit of Judaism.]

[For the judgment [will be] merciless to him who wrought not mercy. Mercy boasteth [triumpheth] over judgment.—M.]

Verse 14. [14] Τί τὸ ὄφελος, Tischend. following the majority of Codd. Lachmann: τί ὄφελος. So also in v. 16.

Lange: .... [what profit doth it bring] if any man were to say that he hath faith, but were to have no works. Faith [in such a case] surely cannot save him?

[.... can his faith [ἡ πίστις] save him?—M.]

Verse 15. [[15] ἐὰν δὲ the most authentic reading; omit δὲ B. Sinait.—M.]

Lange: But if a brother or sister were naked and bare and destitute of daily food.

Verse 16. [16] ὦσιν after λειπόμενοι in A. G. Lachmann, is unimportant as to sense. Sin. [B. C. K. Syr. Tischend. Alford.—M.] omit it.

Lange: And one of you should say to them: Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, but ye were not to give to them those things which are needful to the body, what would that profit?

[And some one from among you say to them ..... but ye give them not the necessaries of the body, what is the profit?—M.]

Verse 17. [17] ἔχῃ ἔργα [A. B. C. K. Tischend. Alf.—M.], is the most authentic and most emphatic reading.

Lange: So also faith, if it has not works, is dead for itself.

[So also faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself (καθ' ἑαυτήν.—M.]

Verse 18. [18] χωρὶς A. B. C. Sin. Lachmann, Tischend. [ἐκ Rec. K. L.—M.]

[19] σου after ἔργων omitted by A. B. [Tischend. Alford.—M.]

[20] μου after ἔργων wanting in Vulg. Syr. B. C. It seems to have originated in the parallelism of this sentence with the one preceding it according to its rejected readings.

[21] B. C. omit μου after πίστιν [A. K. L. insert it.—M.]

Lange: But some one will say [to a man of such faith]: thou hast faith and I have works: show me thy faith without the works [*how canst thou do it?*], and I will show thee my faith out of [by] the works.

[Nay, some one will say .... show me thy faith without [apart from] the works, and I will show thee my faith by [out of ἐκ] my works.—M.]

Verse 19. [22] Different readings, Rec. with G. θεὸς εἷς ἐστι; A. Sinait. Lachmann, εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός; B. Tischend. [Alford]: εἷς ὁ θεός ἐστιν. The strongest emphasis of A is also the most probable.

Lange: Thou believest [*the article of the law and of doctrine*] that God is one: that thou doest well therein; the evil spirits [*the demons*] also believe that and shudder.

Verse 20. [23] νεκρά A. C.** G. K. [Rec. Vulg. Copt.—M.], opposed by ἀργή in B. C.* etc.; the latter more probable (Lachm. and Tischend. support it) because the former seems to have been occasioned by v. 17.

Lange: But wilt thou know it, O empty man! that faith without works is useless [inefficient]?

[.... that faith without [apart from] the works is useless [bootless. Alford]?—M.]

Verse 21. Lange: .... justified [proved righteous] by works [out of works] when he offered Isaac, his son, on the altar of sacrifice [Gen. xxii.]?

[... When he offered Isaac, his son, on the altar.—M.]

Verse 22. [[24] συνέργει A. Sinait.—M.]

Lange: Thou seest that his faith was energetically joined with his works [was manifested as one with his works] and that faith was completed by works [out of works].

[Thou seest that faith was working together with his works and that by [ἐκ] works faith was made complete.

Verse 23. Lange: And thus also was fulfilled .... righteousness [in justification proper Gen. xv. 6.]

Verse 24. [25] τοίνυν wanting in A. B. C. Sin. [Tisch. Alf.—M.] etc.

Lange: Ye see [therefore] that by [out of] works man is justified [proved righteous as man] etc.

Verse 25. [26] κατασκόπους, C. G. seems to be taken from Heb. xi. 31.

Lange: ..... and sent them forth by another way.

Verse 26. [[27] χωρὶς ἔργων. B. Sinait.—M.]

Lange: For as the body without spirit etc.

§ 1. Chapter II. 1-13.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Analysis: Caution against partiality in the Christian Church-life, that is against the Ebionitizing preference of the Jewish Christian and putting back of the Gentile Christian, in connection with the demand of the proof of faith in the exhibition of brotherly love.—Leading points: Reference to the abolition of respect of persons by the Christ of glory.—Ebionite conduct in a parable, vv. 1-4.—Reference to the faith of the poor (in a symbolical sense) as well as to the unbelief of the rich (cf. Matth. xxii. 1-10), vv. 5-7.—True fidelity of the law or the fulfilling of the whole law in the royal commandment of love, as well as the damnable transgression of the whole law in sinning against this commandment, vv. 8-13.—The true life of faith or faith evinced by the mercy of brotherly love and dead faith illustrated by heartless demeanour, vv. 14-17.—The proof of faith by the works of faith or the believer's justification before the consciousness of the Church; vv. 18, 19.—The two examples of the proof of faith by works as a general example of the unity of the living faith of Jews and Gentiles, vv. 20-26.

Caution against partiality in Christian Church-life, that is against Ebionitizing demeanour. The parable of such demeanour. vv. 1-4.

Ver. 1. **My brethren, do not practise.**—The Apostle does not, as is generally supposed, pass from the doctrine of charity to a particular example of charity. If this were so, the example would be ill-chosen, for respect of persons does not violate primarily the duty of charity but the law of justice and equality. He rather passes on to a new form of the temptation.

This clause is not (as Schneckenburger and Kern take it) interrogative, not because the fact in question is beyond all doubt (Huther), for the interrogative form would express this more definitely (is it not so that ye, etc.), but because the form of a warning exhortation makes it imperative. The interrogative construction is inadmissible not only because of the analogy in ch. i. 16 but also on account of the parable which shows the form of the temptation to which they were exposed.

Do not practise:—ἔχειν denotes not only, "do not hold your faith as if it were shut up in προσωπολῃψίαις" (Huther); still less, "do not detain your faith" (κατέχετε Grotius), but still stronger "do not hold, cherish it in this form." The faith of fanaticism is not only allied with particularisms but the particularisms constitute its very glory. The Plural προσωπολῃψίαι points to the ever returning and diversified occurrences of this kind.

The faith in our Lord Jesus, the Christ.—Different constructions: 1. The faith in our Lord of glory, Jesus Christ (de Wette, Wiesinger, and al.; reference to 1 Cor. ii. 8). This construction is inadmissible on account of the position of τῆς δόξης. 2. δόξα taken in a different sense from its ordinary signification=opinion (Calvin: the knowledge of Christ obscured by the respect paid to wealth). Wholly inadmissible, because this mode of expression would be most remarkable and because the faith of Christ itself could not be thus disfigured. 3. τοῦ κυρίου etc. Genitive of the subject: the faith, derived from our Lord Jesus Christ, on the glory (Huther). 4. Bengel: τῆς δόξης is in apposition to Christ *ut ipse Christus dicatur ἡ δόξα. Gloria.* Luke ii. 32; Eph. i. 17 etc. Christ, the glory not sufficiently developed, although the idea that Christ is the Schechinah would otherwise be quite suitable. 5. Laurentius unites δόξης with Χριστοῦ, *Christus gloriæ*, but Huther objects that this construction would require the Article before Χριστοῦ. This would however occasion an error as if a twofold Christ were conceivable. In German however we have to emphasize the Article, as far as it is in τῆς δόξης. The sense is plain: faith in the Christ of glory is incompatible with estimating persons according to carnal respects. See the analogous idea 2 Cor. v. 16 and Eph. ii. 16, 17. Christ in virtue of His exaltation has also acquired the κυριότης of the unbelieving Jews. See Matth. xxvi. 64; Rom. ix. 5. [But on the whole it seems best, because it is the least forced construction, to govern τῆς δόξης by κυρίου, see 1 Cor. ii. 8.—M.]

Ver. 2. **For if there had entered;** γάρ gives the reason not of the whole exhortation as such, but of the reference (connected with it) to the glory of Christ, which Luther has made prominent in his free translation; Do not suppose that faith in Jesus Christ, our Lord of glory, suffers respect of persons. The construction which makes the antecedent extend to the end of v. 4 and then makes the consequent begin (Michaelis, Herder etc.) has been justly set aside by Huther; v. 4 is the consequent. The reference of the following exhortation to misconduct in worship has led to the opinion that James is primarily addressing the Church-wardens (Grotius etc). We have already shown that this view over against the grand prophetico-symbolical expression of the Apostle is inadequate The misconduct to which James refers is so general and important as to preclude the literal acceptation of what follows. In the first place it cannot be assumed that such a grievance as that of assigning bad places to the poor had spread throughout the entire Jewish Christian dispersion and in the second, it is even more improbable that James should have received reliable information concerning a disorder so universally prevalent. The ἐάν also and the Aorist indicate a relation which has become historical and is still in course of development.

Into your common-assembly.—Schneckenburger and al. interpret the Jewish synagogue, Huther, the place of the Christian assembly, de Wette, with reference to Heb. x. 25, the religious assembly. But the Article indicates that the *one* synagogue of the entire Jewish Christian dispersion is meant, that is their religious community symbolically described by the name of the Jewish place of worship. The symbol is the more appropriate in that it characterizes the family-bias to union in Judaism. The reference to civil judicial assemblies, which Herder and al. find here, is altogether unfounded. We have endeavoured to bring out in the translation the uniting element of Christianity.

If there had entered a man.—The Aorist not only aids the imagination by its picturesque force but indicates the historical fact that believers with Judaistic pretensions had already entered the Church.

With a gold finger-ring.—The character of the parables delineating and censuring on the one hand the factious conduct of the Jewish Christians towards the Judaizers proper and on the other towards the Gentile Christians, comes out in the most decided manner. According to Wiesinger and Huther our text gives only an example *instar omnium* for the representation of that sinful προσωποληψία, while many older commentators see in it only a figure of the preference of the rich to the poor, and these are the common views. These views give only rise to the question whether the rich and the poor are to be considered members of the Christian commonwealth (Knapp, Theile, de Wette), or unbelievers or *hospites* (Pott, Kern, Schneckenburger). Wiesinger, in support of the former view, alleges that the Epistle being addressed to Christian readers, the oppressive disparities between rich and poor should be taken as introcongregational (ch. iv. 1; vv. 13—15; v. 1); Huther, in support of the latter, that the rich are distinguished from the brethren etc.; Weiss (*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft*, 1854, No. 51) makes the rich a non-Christian, the poor a Christian. Schwegler is altogether wrong in making the rich the Gentile Christian and the poor the Jew, for it would follow from this that the Jewish Christians did exhibit partiality towards the Gentile Christians. But he is on the right track in that he sees in the Epistle a reflection of the circumstances of the time. Now we hold that the rich here and throughout the Epistle is not less symbolical than the rich in the Gospel (Matth. xix. 24 etc.) and just so the poor. But the attributes of the rich indicate whereof he is proud. He is in the first place a χρυσοδακτύλιος (the word ἅπαξ λεγ.). That rings with the ancients, especially among the Jews (as a signet-ring) were highly esteemed is evident from Gen. xli. 42; Esther iii. 10; viii. 2; Luke xv. 22. Received as a gift it denotes the prerogative of representing the donor; in the parable of the prodigal doubtless the restoration to the filial state. But the man with the gold ring cannot be any other than the Judaist priding himself in and boasting of his covenant-right and sonship (which to the humble was indeed a veritable gold-ring see Rom. ix.), as a χρυσοδακτύλιος, *a gold-finger-ring-wearer by profession.* He is further described by *wearing* a splendid garment (λαμπρός) which according to Rev. xv. 6 involves in particular the idea of purity and connected therewith denotes the Jewish pretensions to purity and holiness or glory. In like manner the garment of the poor, that is, of the Gentile Christian, is not stained in the ordinary sense but from a religious point of view, as is proved by the ῥυπαρός Zech. iii. 3, 4. In Rev. xxii. 11 also it denotes the opposite of the Holy in a symbolical sense. According to the Jewish conception of purity the Gentile Christians had entered the Church in such a garment; but that James notwithstanding accords to them the wedding-garment is evident from v. 25. Raphelius on λαμπρός, "*nullum certum colorem declarat, sed splendidum, clarum, nitidum, seu rubrum sit, seu alius generis.*"

Ver. 3. **And ye were looking upon.**—Ἐπιβλέπειν is emphatic (*Pott*). Upon the ὁ φορῶν τὴν ἐσθῆτα, also very significant, he who *wears that* and carries himself in wearing it. Instead of experiencing disgust at the spectacle of vanity, which manifestly looks out of that proud dress, they suffer themselves to be deceived by that glitter, which in their estimate should have been valueless, and to be awed by the haughty claims to it. This rich man is first looked at, contemplated in astonishment, then complimented, he also stands first; meanwhile the eye is averted from the poor man, who is furthermore despatched in a hurry. "The difference of speech to the one and to the other strongly marks the contrast; they are first distinguished by σύ—σύ, then κάθου and στῆθι, ὧδε and ἐκεῖ, καλῶς and ὑπὸ τὸ ὑποπόδιόν μου are opposites" (Huther). The addition "or sit thou here, etc," as allowing him to be seated, is intended to modify the hardness of the word "keep standing there," but becomes a further humiliation, "sit here under my footstool." This means certainly "down at my footstool." but the expression involves contempt; as it were under one's feet. Not *on* the footstool. The Judaist either wanted to acknowledge the Gentile Christian merely as *hospes* in the Church, or to concede to him at most an inferior right of communion. As the reading ἐπί [for ὑπό B** —M.] indicates a tendency to soften the harshness of the expression, a similar tendency may have omitted τῶν ποδῶν before μου.

Ver. 4. **Did ye not then separate among yourselves.**—The comments on this passage are wide apart. Some plead οὐ as a declaration, others as a question. 1. Those who take it *declaratorily:* then, partly ye would not have distinguished (according to sound judgment) among yourselves, partly ye would have judged after an evil manner of thinking (Grashof); or, "then ye are not any longer distinguished among yourselves, *i. e.*, godly and ungodly" (Oeder); or, "then ye have not rightly judged among yourselves" (Oecumenius, Bengel); or, "then ye have not yet judged yourselves" (Heisen); "not *yourselves* but your garments" (Cajetan). But the construction is decidedly in favour of the interrogative form, particulary the hypothetical form and the brevity of the consequent. Hence 2, *interrogatively: a.* διακρίνεσθαι=to doubt in the sense of having scruples concerning a thing. "Ye had no scruples, etc.?" (Theile). *b.* to doubt in the literal sense: "have ye not become doubters in your faith? or similarly (de Wette, Wiesinger, Huther); *c.* the verb=to *judge:* do ye then not judge among yourselves?" (Augusti); or the Verb *passive:* "Do ye not condemn yourselves? (Paraeus). *d.* to make difference; did ye not make differences (in a bad sense) among yourselves?" (Grotius, Knapp and al.). This interpretation passes into *e.* to separate, to divide in a Passive or Middle sense. But the Middle sense lies nearest: do ye not separate, divide yourselves in or among yourselves? (Semler, Gebser, Schneckenburger). We hold with Schneckenburger that the beginning of dissen-

sion in the Church primarily takes rise in the minds of those factious Christians. They are also at schism in themselves, which schism although it begins with doubting (ch. i. 6) means more than doubting, as is the case in our time with those confessional zealots [confessional= pertaining to a confession, used in German almost as the synonyme of denomination—M.], who suspend the communion of the Lord's Supper with other Evangelicals while they are willing otherwise to hold fraternal intercourse with them. Creating dissensions reacts on the zealots themselves so that they become divided in themselves. Wiesinger and Huther allege in favour of their exposition that διακρίνεσθαι in the New Testament constantly signifies to doubt, which it does in many passages. But the Middle of our verb occurs in our sense in Jude 5, 22 and the transition from the Active (Acts xv. 9) to the Middle lay quite near. καί intensifies the question. We have endeavoured in our translation to bring out the paronomasia of κριταί and διακρίθητε [In German: *zerschieden* and *Schiedsrichter*.—M.]. From the evil schism in the heart springs evil judging in the life. Richter: *after* (according to) evil considerations (motives), not the evil, etc. That is, according to the motives of national preferences, claims and prejudices, outward position, etc.

Reference to the faith of the poor in a symbolical sense as well as to the faith of the sick vv. 5–7.

VER. 5. **Listen, my beloved brethren.**—The painful earnestness of the Apostle's mind in view of the dangerous symptoms he had described may be seen in his animated exhortation, his lively address (see ch. i. 16) and his questions.

Did not God choose the poor?—Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 26. Huther: "poor to the world" [Germ. *for* the world.—M.]. Wiesinger: "poor as regards the world." In the latter sense reference may be made to the analogous τῷ πνεύματι Matth. v. 3. But that condition of poverty as to the Spirit, simultaneously expresses a longing for the Spirit. But such an element would be out of place here, hence the sense "to the world" is more appropriate. These persons whom you call poor, because they are Gentile Christians, are rather poor *to* the world according to their relation to the world; but to you they ought to be rich, seeing they are rich in faith. The fact that the Ebonites afterwards called themselves poor as regards this world, presents no obstacle to this exposition. Their *usus loquendi* was doubtless rather formed after the pattern of James than *vice versa*, just as the Gnostics did probably borrow many of their expressions from Paul, not Paul from them. [But the sense "poor as regards the world" is after all at least as good as that given by Lange; it is general, and there is no reason why even Lange's interpretation may not be included in it: the Dative of reference here simply shows that these persons were poor with reference to the world objectively or subjectively or both.—M.]

Rich in faith.—Not rich in the possession of much faith [*nicht reich* an *Glauben*. GERM.—M.], but they are rich in virtue of their faith. Still the stress lies not only on the general being rich, the result of the general condition of believing, but also on the particular measure of their being rich as contrasted with the false being rich of the Judaists. *Who are rich in faith.* Huther: Πλουσίους ἐν πίστει not in apposition with τοὺς πτωχούς (Erasmus, Baumgarten, etc.), but the complement of ἐξελέξατο, stating whereto God did choose the poor (Beza, Wolf, Wiesinger, etc.). But taking James' choosing as exactly synonymous with Paul's we consider to be not proven. Here the word evidently signifies rather calling, with reference to ethical good behaviour to the Divine revelation. That is: "the decree (more definitely the election) of God is here viewed (indicated) in respect of temporal manifestation." Wiesinger. Still an essential element of the idea of election is held fast. The nearer definition of the election lies in καὶ κληρονόμους sc. εἶναι. That is: Did not God choose these poor according to the world (from among the Gentiles) who prove themselves rich in faith, that they also may be heirs of the kingdom? Cf. Acts xv. 14, etc.; Eph. ii.—It is to be borne in mind that only the poor to the world were also the "rich" among the Jews. But this characteristic was not enough here, while the correction "poor to the world, rich in faith" was sufficiently definite. James therefore here utters the same idea, on which Paul laid peculiar stress as the characteristic of his evangelization, Eph. iii. 3–6, etc.—κληρονόμους here, points not to the kingdom as future (so Huther), but as καὶ κληρονόμους to the joint participation in the true υἱοθεσία of the Jews.—

Heirs of the kingdom.—It is the kingdom of God, the real theocracy completed in the New Testament, progressing towards eschatological completion, not the latter only, as Huther maintains. James separates from this kingdom whatever is particularly Jewish, describing it as *the* kingdom, that peculiar kingdom which God has prepared for those who love Him. The common construction gives a proposition not limited like 1 Cor. i. 26-28, and not sufficiently proven by Matth. xix. 23, 26; viz.: "chosen the poor in this sense that those whom God did choose belong to *this* category, while those belonging to the category of the rich have not been chosen." (Huther). It is impracticable to take the *one* expression literally, the *other* figuratively.

VER. 6. **But ye dishonoured the poor** (man).—δὲ denotes the antithesis of θεός, ἠτιμάσατε the antithesis of ἐξελέξατο, as Huther rightly observes. Still the Aorist is used, not only because reference is made to vv. 2 and 3, and because the case is general, but its historical force points to a historical fact, in which Judaizing Jewish Christians have already taken part with the Jews, viz.: the dishonouring of the Gentile Christians.

But is it not the rich?—These rich, who *use violence towards themselves*, i. e. the Christians, (cf. the expressions Matth. xx. 25). The reference here is not any more to the rich in general than before to the poor (both according to Huther). The populace took as much part in the persecution of the Christians as the nobility, the former indeed were conspicuous in it. Nevertheless it was with the Judaists who fancied themselves theocratically rich, that the impulses to the persecution of the Christians did then still

originate. So *e. g.* the first persecution of the Apostles, the execution of Stephen. *καὶ αὐτοί*, it is just they. All sympathizing of Christian ultras with Judaistic Jews contained the germ of want of self-respect, as is the case nowadays with all sympathizing of the evangelical ultras with the ultramontanists and that of pietistic ultras with the confessionalists. Is it not just they who excommunicate you? one might ask in the latter cases.

VER. 7. **Is it not just they who blaspheme that fair name?**—Favouring those rich ones would involve not only want of self-respect but even a participation in the guilt of their blasphemous conduct in respect of the fair name. This blaspheming cannot be taken figuratively as if it did denote insult heaped on that fair name by the evil works of the Christian rich men themselves, as Huther rightly observes in refutation of the views of several commentators (also of Wiesinger, whose citations, *e. g.* Jer. lii. 5: *δι' ὑμᾶς τὸ ὄνομα μου βλασφημεῖται* and similar ones, do not prove that *βλασφημεῖν* has the direct meaning "to dishonour"), nor can the reference be (according to Hensler) to the Christian name, for that is just the transfer of that name to them; the name of the poor is altogether out of the question. It is only the name of *Christ* to which reference is made, whether believers were already called *χριστιανοί* (which was the case, in part at least, Acts xi. 26), or not. The name of Christ was transferred to them as a surname denoting at once their peculiarity and to whom they belonged. [They were *Christ's χριστοῦ*, 1 Cor. iii. 23.—M.]. The expression is formed after the Hebrew model שֵׁם נִקְרָא עַל (Deut. xxviii. 10; 2 Chron. vii. 14; cf. Is. iv. 1; Gen. xlviii. 16 and Acts xv. 14, 17). In virtue of the fact that once the name of Jehovah was called over Israel, Israel was described the people of Jehovah; in like manner Christians are now the Christian people (the people of Christ—M.] in virtue of the name of Christ. His name is called fair, in opposition to the insulting blaspheming; it is the fair, the glorious name *κατ' ἐξοχήν*; the name of the Lord of Glory (ch. ii. 1), in which is all salvation (Acts iv. 1; Phil. ii. 10, Wiesinger). The Christian rich men could not any more be reproached with the sin of blaspheming the name of Christ (*βλασφημεῖν* always denotes abusive *language*, Huther), than the non-Christian rich men in general (the names even of Pilate, Gallio, Agrippa, Festus and al. may here be called to mind); the reproach fitted solely, if the Judaists were the rich in a figurative sense; to them it was wholly applicable.

True fidelity of the law or the fulfilling of the whole law in the royal commandment of love, as well as the damnable transgression of the whole law in sinning against this commandment, vv. 8–13.

VER. 8. **If, indeed, ye fulfil the royal law.**—The connection, by the introduction of *μέντοι*, is difficult, but only, if doubts remain as to what precedes. James had just now reproved his readers for being partial to Judaists, proud of the law and fancying themselves rich, *i. e.* because they themselves were not free from legal onesidedness. The progress of the thought fully accords therewith: "The whole consistency of true fidelity to the law, to be sure, ye ought to exhibit, according to the commandment, thou shalt love, etc.; but your partiality is a breach of the law." According to Huther and many others (Calvin, Theile etc.) James wants to meet the excuse of his readers that their respect of the rich was the outgoing of love; but surely no Jew could have thought of representing *προσωποληψία* as love. Although in this case *μέντοι* is rendered *certainly* (*indeed*, German *freilich*) the sense is different: *igitur* (Schneckenburger) and *yet* (de Wette) are also set aside by our explanation. [Whichever particle be chosen, *μέντοι* is clearly *adversative.*—M.].

The royal law.—The law denotes here not a single commandment (as *Huther* maintains with reference to Jer. xxxi. 33, Heb. viii. 10; x. 16), for the commandment cited immediately afterwards embraces the whole law as completed in the New Testament. It is *royal* not only because it is supreme and the most excellent (so Wiesinger with reference to Philo, Plato and also Theile, Schneckenburger and al.). Although Christ, placing Himself on the Jewish stand-point calls it *first* and *great*, immediately afterwards He describes it as *all-embracing* and *principial* (Matt. xxii. 39), and this New Testament conception of it is found also in Paul, Rom. xiii. 8-10; Gal. v. 14. Now if this *principial* [*i. e.* original, initial, elementary—M.] nature of the law and this its *oneness*, Mark xii. 32, are inferred from the Oneness of God, the Giver of the Law, the explanation that it is called royal because it proceeds from God its Author, is not so far-fetched (Raphelius, Wetstein and al.), as Wiesinger supposes, who says that this is true in respect of the whole law; but this objection lacks point, inasmuch as the cited commandment is really the whole law; but it leads to the exposition that the "royal commandment is the commandment of Christ" (Grotius). Its applying to kings as well as to other men (Michaelis) its being a *via regia* (Calvin), are explanations which do not reach the fundamental idea; its *making* kings (Thomas) is less remote; but it is probably called here the law royal and the law of the kingdom, because of the authority of rich men and the contrast between rich and poor must completely vanish before the authority of the king. Before Christ, the Lord of Glory, who has comprehended all laws in this one law, the rich are low and the poor rich (ch. ii. 1; i. 9 etc.) *Negatively*, the law completed in the New Testament is a principle of perfect liberty (Acts i. 35), *Positively* it is a royal principle exacting perfect obedience to the Lord. Hence we have here once more the word *τελεῖν* conformably to the previously repeated allusions to the New Testament *τέλος*. [But why not take *νόμον βασιλικὸν* in its plain and obvious sense, the law *royal*, "the law which is the *king* of all laws" (Alford)? This rendering (with reference to Rom. xiii. 10) suits the context well.—M.]—*κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν* refers not only to *τελεῖτε* but to the whole sentence *νόμον βασιλικὸν τελεῖτε* for the *νόμος* Ex. xx. in its higher royal form is already traced beforehand, Lev. xix. 18, while that discursive form of the law is referred to the ministration of angels (Gal. iii. 19).

Ye do well. (German: "*ye act beautifully*,")

—That is: conformably to the beautiful name, which those men blaspheme. Christianly beautiful, answering to the spiritual beauty or the glory of the name of Christ. Huther's remark that here something is to be conceded, not without irony, to the opponents, lies outside of the context.

VER. 9. **But if ye respect persons.**—προσωποληπτεῖν is ἅπαξ λεγ. and admirably chosen by James to denote Judaizing Christianity. By such conduct they suppose to avoid sin, but he tells them: by this very thing ye are working sin (ἐργάζεσθαι is stronger than ποιεῖν, Matth. vii. 23, etc.).

Convicted by the law.—The reference here is certainly to the specific prohibition of prosopolepsy [respect of persons—M.] Deut. xvi. 19 and similar interdictions (Huther denies it), inasmuch as it formulates the commandment of love literally and at the same time in the light of it acquires a more general sense; that is, the law of love in its oneness, as applied to the question under notice, runs into an express prohibition of prosopolepsy. The very law therefore on which the Judaist plumes himself, convicts him as a transgressor. The choice of the word παραβάτης has here, as in Rom. ii. 25, and like παράβασις ch. v. 14, a peculiar emphasis; the Judaistico-Ebionite transgression of the law as completed in the New Testament is, as it were, a second fall. Cf. Gal. ii. 18.

VER. 10. **For whosoever shall have kept the whole law.**—Hypothetical case, put so as to apply at once to the Jewish stand-point in its full consequence and to the Christian, without being ambiguous, because the full consequence of Judaism leads to Christianity. The uniform solidarity of the law is also acknowledged by the Jews; hence Rabbi Jonathan says; "*quod si faciat omnia, unum vero omittat, omnium est singulorum reus.*" ἐν ἑνί is to be taken agreeably to the preceding. Not the *one* definite commandment of love (Oecumenius, Semler), which embraces the whole but any one point of the law. Since νόμοι is rarely used to denote the Mosaic commandments one might feel inclined to take ἑνί as a neuter (with Schneckenburger and Kern), but since the following πάντων, according to Huther and al., renders the construction difficult, it is better to assume James entering into the Jewish mode of view which he potentiates in saying that every separate ἐντολή has also the full force of a νόμος. Wiesinger says that James takes the most favourable case in order to make his statement as convincing as possible. But James is hardly willing to yield this most favourable case to the reader. The point to be made is the demonstration of the absolute inviolability of the law. The πταίειν may be understood as well of a slight offence as of a gross offence, the declaration holding good in either case; but the context seems to require the latter construction which is also favoured by the preposition ἐν. Whosoever offends in *one point* so as to fall, is preëminently a transgressor of all laws, *i. e.*, he is an apostate. This sense follows more clearly from the sequel. Such an one is ἔνοχος, *i. e.*, held fast in guilt [Germ. arrested—M.] for satisfaction by the suffering of punishment. Each separate law becomes as it were a judge who arrests him.

VER. 11. **For He who said.**—The unity of all commandments lies primarily in the unity of the Lawgiver, Mark xii. 32. This implies of course the One Spirit of all commandments according to which all commandments are included in each separate commandment and the *one* sense: the requirement of love and the *one* recompense.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.—Different explanations have been given of the selection of these two commandments. Baumgarten: Because their transgression was punished with death; Wiesinger: because the readers are nowhere charged with μοιχεύειν (see for the contrary ch. iv.), whereas μὴ φονεύσῃς has the commandment of love as its kernel, because these are the first duties under the law of love to one's neighbour. However we have here once more to call attention to the symbolical character of this Epistle. To the Israelite the prohibition of adultery was at once the prohibition of religious apostasy to heathenism (which probably accounts for the transpositions Mark x. 19, etc. of which Huther makes mention), and the prohibition of murder at once that of lovelessness [coined from the German *Lieblosigkeit*, for want of a current English equivalent—M.] towards our neighbour. The sense therefore is probably as follows: the same God to whose commandment you appeal in your fear of intermingling with heathenism, has prohibited murder, of which you may become guilty by your hatred of men. We have no doubt that also 1 Jno. iii. 15 refers primarily to Ebionite conduct towards Christian fellowship (ch. ii. 19). The connection of the words with Matth. v. 17–19 is clear.

VER. 12. **So speak ye and so do ye.**—Application drawn from what has gone before, but not a new section (Semler). Huther wants to connect οὕτως with what follows, not with what has gone before. But the double οὕτως as well as the anteposition of λαλεῖτε refer strongly to what has gone before. The readers of the Epistle are charged not only after the manner of laymen to judge according to the anti-judaistic conception of the law, which had been laid down, but also to assert it in their respective spheres as witnesses of the truth (see ch. iii). Thus they were first to speak and to testify but then of course also to act accordingly.

As those about to be judged by the law of liberty.—This is not the explication but the reason of the preceding exhortation. The question comes up why here again James calls the New Testament the law of liberty as in ch. i. 25 and not, as above, the royal law? The law of liberty is the New Testament principle of the new life in the Gospel of Christ, which frees us from the restraint of the law. Conscious that according to their faithful or unfaithful conduct with reference to this law they are to be judged, true Jewish Christians and Israelites must cheerfully testify against Judaism and its legalism and exhibit Christian fellowship. It is true that this νόμος, as such, admits least a non-observance of this or that commandment (Huther), but this is hardly the reason why it is called νόμος ἐλευθερίας.

VER. 13. **For the judgment is [will be] merciless.**—*Unmerciful* is inadequate. Cf. Matth. v. 6; ch. xviii. 23; xxv. 35. The saying is primarily true objectively. The judgment

will be rigidly enforced according to the love displayed in our life by mercy shown to the poor, the suffering and the despised. But the saying holds also good subjectively. A hard, merciless man reacts by his conduct upon his own consciousness; he makes himself a hard self-tormentor, who cannot but see the judgment in all his experience and a merciless judicial decree in all judgment.

Mercy boasteth over judgment.—The asyndeton intensifies the antithesis. Since κατακαυχᾶσθαι with the Genitive denotes *boasting oneself against* or *over* (see Rom. xi. 8; Jas. iii. 14), ἔλεος must not be completed by θεοῦ (so Calvin, Bengel and al.), nor interpreted as the triumphant exaltation with which mercy by its assurance of grace *confounds* (*puts to shame*) the terrors of the judgment (so Wiesinger), or transforms them into signs of redemption, as says our Lord (Luke xxi. 38); but it rather signifies the triumphant assurance with which the evangelizing mercy of believers, especially that of a James, a Peter or a Paul or the Gentile world excelled the judging spirit of the Judaists, the cheerful Gospel excelled the gloomy Talmud, the Church of the world the synagogue of the Jewish quarter and the evangelical confession the inquisition of the Middle Ages, to say nothing of the triumph of Christian philanthropy over modern particularism.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Against the genuineness of the Epistle of James there is probably not raised an objection apparently more just than that the person of Christ is less prominent in it than in other Epistles and that the author occupies a comparatively lower Christological standpoint than the most famous Apostles. It certainly does not contain the richly developed Christology which characterizes the writings of Paul and John. The Christology of James in general is on a level with that of his brother Jude and not essentially different from that of the synoptical Gospels. The mind of James is rather practical and ethical than dogmatical and speculative. Even in respect of insight into the nature of Christ there was among Apostolical authors doubtless a diversity of gifts, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 7. It is also very probable that James in his wisdom as a teacher deemed it more judicious to refer the readers whom he addressed, more to the moral precepts of the Gospel than chiefly to the Person of the Redeemer. On this account the comparatively few passages in which he speaks of Him with decision, as *e. g.* in ch. ii. 1, deserve the greater attention. On the sense of the remarkable expression τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης see under *Exegetical and Critical.* This single passage proves conclusively how far James was from conceiving Christ (as some maintain) according to the old-Ebionite manner to have been a ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος. Describing himself as the *servant* (bondman) of Jesus Christ (ch. i. 1) shows unmistakably how far he places the Master above himself, and describing Him as κύριος τῆς δόξης, he not only attributes to Him a royal rank but, indirectly at least, a higher Divine nature far exalted above all creatures. Cf. Ps. cx. 1; Heb. i. 18. Nor must we overlook his mentioning the Lord Jesus Christ at the very beginning of his Epistle in immediate connection with God Himself, and his constant reference to God as the *Father* shows not indistinctly that in doing so he had before his mind's eye the high and holy relation of God the Father to the *Son*. Of equal importance in estimating the Christology of James is the circumstance of his unequivocally calling *Christ* the *Lord*, that is transferring to Him the Old Testament name of God with which he was familiar from his earliest childhood; ch. v. 7, 8. Such an appellation was only possible on the conviction that He, who in the Old Testament is universally called *Jehovah* (Jahve), has revealed Himself in the New Testament as God (the Father) *and* as Christ. Cf. Wiesinger's Commentary on James, p. 65, and Dorner's *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Christologie*, 2d ed., I., p. 95.

2. We should wholly misunderstand James' reproof of the sin of respect of persons, were we to infer from it that he was aiming at the establishment of a perfect equality in daily life or even in the assemblies of the Church. God Himself sanctions difference of rank and station, Prov. xxii. 2; Matth. xxvi. 11. But it is contrary to the will of God, if men overstep the line of demarcation which He in wisdom has drawn, turn it into an impassable gulf and with the existing difference overlook the higher unity. The arrangement therefore, which especially in former times was so frequently prevalent in many evangelical churches, of assigning splendid seats of honour to the distinguished and of putting back the poor as much as possible, would surely be contrary to the spirit of James. It is one thing to recognize a Divinely appointed difference, but it is another to make arbitrary distinction in the public worship of God.

3. James also teaches the doctrine of God's eternal election of grace irrespective of wealth or poverty or any outward prerogatives whatsoever. Although it is true that poverty *per se* is no recommendation and wealth *per se* presents no insuperable obstacle (cf. Matth. xix. 25, 26; Jno. xix. 38, 39), it is on the other hand not less indubitable (and also a real compensation for so many things of which the poor are deprived in this world), that comparatively by far the greatest number of those who are rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom are found among the poor.

4. The idea of Christian Church-life involves among other things the non-existence of lawsuits among believers, or at least the settling of their differences among themselves. Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 1-4. The readers of the Epistle of James appear however to have been far from realizing this ideal, and as a rule it was just the rich who in this respect most oppressed their poor brethren. This is therefore an additional reason for not showing them any greater honour than that to which they were legitimately entitled.

5. David was held guilty of having caused the enemies of God to blaspheme in consequence of his sin with Bathsheba and Uriah, 2 Sam. xii. 14. Equally guilty are in James' eyes those who by their oppressive conduct cause the goodly name of the Lord to be blasphemed to the

Church, the name which in Baptism was invoked over His people. This is again an indirect proof that he ascribes to the Lord Jesus Christ a really Divine dignity.—

6. "The giving of the law on Mount Sinai took place mainly by the Son of God, who as the Angel of the Lord had led the children of Israel through the wilderness and is on that account called by the prophets King of Israel (Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; Numb. xxiv. 17; Jer. xxx. 21; Jno. i. 49; Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 16), and King of all kings; hence the words *royal law* refer particularly to Christ, who in His sayings and sermons did so strongly inculcate the duty of love (Matth. xxii. 38, 39; Jno. xv. 12, 17; 1 Jno. ii. 5; iv. 20, 21). To love oneself, that is in a well-ordered manner, is nothing else than taking care of one's temporal, spiritual and eternal welfare, so that one's spiritual welfare may also promote one's temporal prosperity. This is done, if we are truly the servants of God, believe on Him and love Him. Now where this love of oneself is well-ordered, it is also a rule of a well-ordered love of one's neighbour; see Matth. vii. 12." Starke.

7. "A single sin against the commandment of God (though he have kept all others) condemns the sinner and burdens him with the curse. If it is presumptuous and intentional, it deprives him of spiritual life, destroys faith, etc., as in the case of David by adultery, in that of Peter by denial and in that of Adam by eating the forbidden fruit. If it is committed through infirmity and haste, sin as sin carries within itself the venom of damnableness, although preserving grace and forgiveness prevent its execution. The law is, as it were, a garment, which is torn altogether, although you only take away a piece thereof; it is like harmony in music which is wholly spoiled if only one voice is out of tune." Starke.

8. "If a man transgress only one commandment and, if it were possible, should keep all the other commandments of the law, he would still be guilty of the whole law, because he has offended the same God who gave the whole law and insists upon its being kept not according to one commandment only, but wholly according to all its parts; whence every man may abundantly know that there is not any single sin so trifling and bad as not to be liable to damnation, since also the most trivial offence against the law is a transgression of the whole law. But God forgiving the penitent even the grossest offences in their justification, is done for Christ's sake, just as in the case of the converted their daily sins of infirmity, although damnable in themselves, for Christ's sake are not imputed unto damnation." Starke.

9. The moral life of the Church of Christ was at all times exposed to the peril of two opposite rocks; moral rigorism on the one hand and antinomian latitudinarianism on the other. The doctrine of James (vv. 10–12) concerning the indivisible unity of the Divine Law is admirably adapted powerfully to counteract both maladies. In no event does he favour ascetical rigorism which only too frequently degenerates into soul-killing formalism. The law for which he is zealous, is a law of *liberty* in the loftiest acceptance of the term, yea the entire antithesis of authority and liberty is converted on his standpoint into a higher unity. The Divine law by no means opposes the Christian as *heteronomy*, but if he has received it through faith and love into his inmost consciousness, it becomes to him daily more and more an *autonomy* [*heteronomy* literally another law, then, living according to another law; *autonomy* literally one's own law, then, living according to one's own law, self-goverment.—M.]. But if on the other hand latitudinarianism arrives only too soon at being rigid in some points and yielding and lenient in others, James stands up with inexorable severity and administers the unity of the Divine law as that of an indivisible whole. Even the best Christian involuntarily is easily inclined pharisaically to overrate some commandments and to underrate others (cf. Matth. xxii. 36; xxiii. 23). Many a man, *e. g.* who would fear and tremble at the thought of murder would little hesitate in bearing false witness against his neighbour. Here comes in the admonition, "Whosoever shall have kept the whole law yet offend in one point, has become guilty of all." It is self-evident that James here does not speak of sins of haste, ignorance or infirmity but of intentional, presumptuous or principled transgressions (transgressing on principle) of one of the commandments. Whosoever has thus become guilty, has disturbed the harmony of the Divine law. Of course not in the sense that a murderer is therefore also a thief, an adulterer or a defamer, but because the transgressor of any one commandment disgraces love, which is the key-note and sum-total of all the commandments. The favourite notion of many people that the province of morals recognizes a greater or a smaller number of *adiaphora* therefore is here emphatically denied. He who obstinately transgresses one commandment without actually violating the others, omits doing so only because at that instant he does not feel himself incited to a definite act of disobedience. For did he feel it, he would doubtless withdraw himself with equal swiftness from the restraint of any other commandment. But where is then his respect of the Divine law in its totality? Whichever commandment be transgressed, such transgression always reveals *selfishness* opposing on principle the chief requirement of *love*.

10. The passage, "Mercy boasteth over (against) judgment" (v. 13) is not any more isolated than that it contradicts the evangelical doctrine of free grace. In the Old Testament also the idea is repeatedly expressed that love and mercy disarm to a certain degree the severity of that Divine judgment. See *e. g.*, Is. i. 17, 18; Dan. iv. 27. John the Baptist described and insisted upon actual exhibitions of love as one of the marks of a repentance by which men might flee from the wrath to come, Luke iii. 8–11. Our Lord described the blessedness of the merciful (Matth. v. 7) and set forth love as the standard in the last judgment, Matth. xxv. 34–40. This is also the spirit in which James thinks and speaks and no further intimation is needed to show that he refers to no other Christian mercy than to that which is the fruit of living faith and genuine renovation of the heart. Not only he, who loved much, may therefore hope for forgiveness but also he who asked for

much forgiveness, will now also love much, and may look forward to the judgment with greater calmness because this love of faith supplies to him and to others unequivocal proof that he has passed from death unto life. Cf. 1 Jno. iii. 14.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The glorified Christ, the Lord of the Church, the object of faith. Sincere faith may still be very imperfect. Love and faith are indissolubly united, but love is irreconcilable with partial respectings of persons.—Agreement of the love insisted upon by James and that described by Paul, 1 Cor. xiii.—Rich and poor should appear in the house of prayer at unity among themselves.—Christian liberty, equality and fraternity.—The catchwords of the revolution only caricatures of a Gospel watchword.—The communion of saints is disgraced by lovelessness and party-spirit.—Loveless judging of others ill-becoming to one who will be judged himself.—The prerogatives of the believing poor! 1, They are the elect of God; 2, they are rich in faith; 3, they are heirs of the kindom of heaven which God has promised to them who love Him.—The Gospel opposed both to mobocracy [German '*Proletariat*,' a word always used in a bad sense; this must be my apology for the hybrid mobocracy.—M.] and despotism.—"He that oppresseth the poor, reproacheth his Maker, etc." Prov. xiv. 31.—Poverty evangelically considered.—It is, 1, a great sin, 2, a great shame, 3, a great harm, that the goodly name of Christ, which was invoked over us in Baptism, is dishonoured for our sake; cf. Rom. ii. 23, 24.—Love the foremost requirement made by the royal law of Christianity, Jno. xiii. 34, 35.—The inviolable unity of the Christian code of morality.—"Whosever shall have kept the whole law, but have offended in one point, etc." This saying 1, is apparently strange 2, but nevertheless perfectly true and therefore 3, calculated to solemnize our minds in the judgment we pass on ourselves and to render us careful in that which we pass on others.—The Christian must not consider the commandments of the second table to be less holy than those of the first.—We shall be judged by the law of *liberty*; the meaning, the truth, the solemnity and consolation of this thought.—The connection between faith, love, judgment and acquittal.—The thought of the impending judgment—1, wherein it may alarm the Christian and 2, wherein it may again calm his fears.

On the whole pericope, vv. 1–13.—Of respect of persons. 1. The *character* it discloses: it manifests itself *a*. among Christians (v. 1), *b*. in religious intercourse (vv. 2, 3) and *c*. it springs from impure foundations (v. 4). 2. The *wrong* it inflicts: *a*. on the poor (v. 5), *b*. on the rich (vv. 6, 7), *c*. on ourselves (vv. 8, 9). The *judgment* it deserves; this is *a*. terrible (v. 10), *b*. just (vv. 11, 12), *c*. inevitable (v. 13).—

Starke:—The Jews had the regulation that if the rich and the poor had a cause before a tribunal, both had either to stand or to be seated.

Quesnel:—Godliness forbids not the difference of posts of honour but simply disapproves of the rich only being respected and the poor despised, 1 Cor. xi. 22.—Whoso on account of his occupation has outwardly to wear a vile garment, let him so much the more wear the beautiful garment of Christ's righteousness. Is. lxi. 10.

Starke:—The masses always look more at those who are splendidly attired before the world than at these who are gloriously attired before Christ.

Luther:—The rich enjoy greater privileges than others in things temporal, but not in things spiritual, Luke vi. 24.

Langii Op.:—There are rich in the world who are also rich in God, but there are also poor in the world who are likewise poor in God and these are most miserable for time and for eternity, Gen. xiii. 2.

Hedinger:—To be a beggar but a true Christian is more than being emperor or king without it.

Cramer:—Bodily poverty should not hinder but promote one's salvation Luke xvi. 22.—Those who do not honour Christ in His members are not worthy to be honoured themselves, Luke x. 16; 1 Sam. ii. 30.

Quesnel:—There is nothing greater than the name of Christ, but nothing more to be feared than to bear it unworthily.

Starke:—The royal law of love makes all to be kings, who are however the subjects of the King of kings, 1 Pet. ii. 9; Rev. xviii. 6.

Cramer:—By seeming trifles also the law may be transgressed, Numb. xv. 32, etc.

Nova Bibl. Tub.:—The law exacts perfect obedience.

Hedinger:—Like as the believer fulfils all the commandments of the law, so the ungodly transgresses all the commandments, 1 Jno. iii. 22.—If any man will allow only one sin to have dominion over him, he cannot receive forgiveness of sins, Ps. xxxii. 2.

Starke:—It is as culpable to be silent when we ought to speak as to speak when we ought to be silent, Is. lvi. 10.

Luther:—The Divine law is the only rule of conduct in whatsoever we do in word or deed, Ps. cxix 9, 15, 22.

Quesnel:—To be unmerciful, especially towards the innocent and believers, is a sign of men being merely natural and consequently exposed to the wrath of God, Ps. xxxvii. 26.

Luther:—The unmerciful will be damned without mercy and the merciful will be saved of mercy, Jer. xv. 6; Hos. i. 6.

Lisco (ver. 1–9):—True faith is remote from all sinful partiality.—(vv. 10–13). Of disobedience to the Divine law.—Christianity aims at equalizing the differences among men.

Heubner:—All haughtiness is a denial of faith. Unchristian distinguishing between sins.—What a contradiction! to see Christians dishonour the poor whom God honours.—Without esteeming and keeping all the commandments alike the keeping of this or that is worthless *in the sight of God*.—The assurance which love gives in the judgment.

Von Gerlach:—The Apostle calls Christ the Lord of glory in order to show the nothingness of all human distinctions in His sight.—The law of liberty has freed us from the bondage of sin, from mercenary work-holiness; we should consider therefore what a testimony there will arise against us in the judgment if we make exceptions and do not keep it in voluntary and childlike love.

STIER:—The Christianity of the rich is more frequently ungenuine and not proof than that of the poor.—If a father setting out on a journey lays down ten commandments to be observed by his child during his absence, and the child reserves one to be transgressed by him—dares such a child appear before his father and say: Father I have obeyed thee, nine of the ten commandments I have well kept! Every sin, thus reserved and remaining, every continuing transgression of one commandment given by the same God cancels our righteousness before the law, so that all its fair numbers turn into so many ciphers.

NEANDER:-Diversities and inequalities founded on the natural relations and organizations of society were not to be abrogated by Christianity but rendered less burdensome, they were to be equalized by the common bond of love and to become matter for the exercise of that Christian love.

VIEDEBANDT:—The devil has well succeeded in a double trick: 1. In making the rich think that faith is the disturber of all enjoyment and pleasure, 2. In convincing the poor that faith brings no help.

G. NITZSCH:—We do not call a negro a white man because his teeth are white; so none may be called righteous, who only speaks of *righteousness* or otherwise puts into practice some other part thereof. David says: "I keep all thy commandments."

PORUBSZKY:—Faith in Jesus Christ tolerates no respect of persons.—The moral harmony in the kingdom of God (vv. 10-12).—The taking to heart of Christian mercy (v. 13).

JACOBY (v. 12):—Speaking also is subjected to the royal law of love.—It amounts to the same whether our judgment be bribed by riches in money, in intellect or worldly education.

Vv. 8-13—Pericope on the 21st Sunday after Trinity in the Grand Duchy of Hesse and elsewhere.

BAUR:—Love as to its being and working.

J. MÜLLER:—Love the being of the Christian life.

R. KROMM:—The Christian is *able* and *bound* to keep *all* the commandments of his God.—Of the riches of Christian love.

[V. 1. *Social* differences are allowed among Christians, Rom. xiii. 7; but invidious distinctions and partiality in *spiritual* matters are disallowed and unchristian. In the use of the Sacraments, in prayer and praise, in the hearing of God's Word Christians are on a level. The pew-system is unprimitive and unchristian. The Church is the *Lord's* house, as its name implies (κυριακόν), and in the Lord's house the rich and poor alike ought to be provided with equal accommodation for worship without any invidious, unchristian and worldly reference to their pecuniary ability.—Ecclesiastical preferment of personal *friends* and *relatives*, as such, is another form of respectings of persons.—M.].

WORDSWORTH:—Contemplate the *Lord of glory* (1 Cor. ii. 8), who humbled Himself, and took the poor man's nature, and joined all in Himself, and promises glory to humility (Luke xiv. 11; Jas. iv. 10). This consideration is the groundwork of the Apostle's argument and exhortation. This is the *glory* which Christ Himself offers to you—not the *vain glory* of *this world*, which ye seek by preferring the rich to the poor, and by having men's *persons* in admiration for the sake of advantage to yourselves (Jude 16).

[V. 2. Christian places of worship true synagogues (cf. συναγωγή and ἐπισυναγωγή Heb. x. 25).—M.].

[V. 4. WORDSWORTH:—There are two distinct grounds of censure—

1. That by this partiality they become like *disputants* in a law-suit (cf. 1 Cor. vi. 6), instead of being brethren: this is the rebuke in *this* clause.

2. That they thus constitute themselves into *judges*; this is developed in what follows.

V. 7. The name invoked over Christians in Baptism and in the Benedictions (Matth. xxviii. 29; Acts ix. 14, 21; Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. i. 2; 1 Pet. i. 17).—In the Jewish synagogue that godly name was *blasphemed* (1 Cor. xii. 3); in the Christian synogogue it was *invoked*. ἐπίκλησις in the language of the Church denotes the act of solemn *invocation*. See Bingham, *Eccl. Ant.* 15, 1.—M.].

[V. 13. CHRYSOSTOM:—"Mercy is dear to God, and intercedes for the sinner, and breaks his chains, and dissipates the darkness, and quenches the fire of hell, and destroys the worm and rescues from the gnashing of teeth. To her the gates of heaven are opened. She is the queen of virtues, and makes man like to God, for it is written, Be ye merciful as your Father who is in heaven is merciful. She has silver wings like the dove, and feathers of gold, and soars aloft, and is clothed with divine glory, and stands by the throne of God; when we are in danger of being condemned, she rises up and pleads for us, and covers us with her defence and enfolds us in her wings. God loves mercy more than sacrifice." —M.].

[SHAKSPEARE, Merchant of Venice, Act iv. Scene 1.

The quality of mercy is not strain'd;
It droppeth, as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath: it is twice bless'd;
It blesseth him that gives, and him that takes:
etc.—M.].

---

§ 2. CHAPTER II. 14-26.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The true life of faith or faith evinced by the mercy of brotherly love and dead faith illustrated by heartless demeanour. v. 14-17.

VER. 14. **What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man were to say etc.?**—James, having illuminated outward legality as lacking the principle of love, now takes it up as outward faith (*Gläubigkeit*) lacking both love and the energy of practical demonstration (*Thatbeweis*). The sequel shows what he means by practical demonstration; it is the full communion with believing brethren in love and life. The following section (vv. 14-26) supports his demand by examples from the Old Testament. Here it is to be remembered "that with James πίστις is the

necessary ground of σωτηρία, which is evident from ch. i. 18–21, but of course that πίστις which is not without works. In disputing the former delusion, James adopts his characteristic mode of first stating in clear and well-defined language the fundamental thought on which all the rest depends and he does it by the introduction of brief interrogative sentences, which reject that false opinion." Huther.

What doth it profit? The Article makes ὄφελος emphatic; what is the use, what profit does it bring? That is, all the blessing of the theocratic faith, ultimately also in Jesus as the Messiah, is lost if this faith does not lead to vital fruit. That faith itself is then not true; hence: "IF A MAN WERE TO SAY, THAT HE HATH FAITH. λέγῃ is emphatic, so also Gataker, Stier, de Wette and al. Although de Wette's rendering "IF A MAN PRETENDS," be probably too strong, the assertion of Huther, that the sequel does not give the lie to λέγειν, is incorrect. This is certainly done conditionally in v. 18 where it is maintained that the existence of faith cannot be proved without works. Only thus much may be admitted, that James allows the faith which is merely outward and traditional to pass as a kind of faith, on account of its objective truth he cannot call it false, but on account of its subjective untruth he calls it dead and the contrast of dead and living shows that he distinguishes faith from faith. Now the faith which he calls living needs no further complement; it is a unit as to its living energy, while the faith without works, lacks owing to the absence of works the demonstration of energy of life. If we say "the dead body is without the soul," it does not follow that we think also: "The living man consists of body and soul." Schneckenburger with reason sees something significant in the absence of the Article (ἐὰν πίστιν). Huther rightly asserts that πίστις does not denote here *nuda notitia* or *professio*, because this idea is identical with real faith in the opinion of the speaker; but he is wrong in supposing that πίστις always denotes the same thing in the mind of James. For saying, that πίστις in one is different from πίστις in another, amounts to nothing and it is false to affirm that *fiducia* cannot be denied even to dead faith. Why then is the subject of this faith uniformly the δίψυχος? [The distinction is manifestly between *theoretic belief* unaccompanied by the practice of good works and *vital faith* abounding in good works. Faith is the inward, works the outward. Works are the outward sign and pledge, the demonstration of faith within. The man dramatically introduced in the text has faith (v. 19), but his faith is theoretic belief. There seems to be no necessity for making λέγῃ emphatic.—M.].

But were to have no works—That is, the works specifically belonging to and characteristic of faith. That James particularly refers to the works of brotherly love, is manifest from the sequel.

Faith surely cannot.—The remarkable character of this proposition as contrasted with the doctrine that faith does save is variously gotten over. Some commentators emphasize the artice ἡ before πίστις: *that* faith, such a faith [Bede, "fides illa, quam vos habere dicitis"—M.]. In reply, Wiesinger and Huther observe that the Article is used, because there is a resumption of the previous idea, as ch. i. 3 with reference to ὑπομονή, and ch. i. 15 with reference to ἁμαρτία. But the resumption of the previous idea is sufficient to settle the point that the reference is here to such a faith which has no works. The demonstrative therefore is not contained in ἡ only, but in ἡ πίστις and one might translate, "*thus* faith surely cannot save him." Huther thinks that αὐτόν is emphatic, "him who thus conducts himself, faith cannot save;" but this would make faith an abstract objectivity. The reference therefore is simply to the faith in question, and the explanations of Theile (false faith), Pott (faith only) and similar ones are epexegetical. Huther in his explication of αὐτόν returns to the definition "the faith which has no works," whereas, in order to be consistent, he ought to say, "the man who has no works."

Save him.—σῶσαι relates not to the attainment of *future* salvation, as Huther maintains, but denotes, according to the idea of the New Testament σωτηρία the present, principial salvation of the redemption already experienced and passing through progressive stages of completion to ultimate salvation.

VERS. 15, 16. **But if a brother or a sister.**—The following example in the opinion of Huther (and Wiesinger) explains the preceding proposition by explaining that compassion also without corresponding works is dead and useless. But the reference to dead love or even to dead compassion would be unheard of. The question in one example also is *dead faith*, which under certain circumstances hypocritically affects the appearance of love without however evincing the reality of its existence. The absence of the work is just the absence of love or compassion. The brother and the sister are as such fellow-believers (companions of the same faith). And this leads to take these personages also in a symbolical sense. For the duty of relieving the literally needy with food and raiment was already recognized in the Old Testament as a duty of man to man; how much more then under the sense of duty acknowledged in the Christian Church. James doubtless needed not to inculcate this duty on the believing dispersion, and if it was his intention, he could not limit its exercise to Christian brethren. But the case stood differently with regard to the relation of the Jewish Christian to his Gentile-Christian co-religionist or also to the Gentile-Christian Church. That they were not literally poor and naked does not affect the question, for on the one hand they were indebted to the Apostles, who were more merciful than the Judaists, for their spiritual prosperity, and on the other hand they would still appear as very poor to the Judaists; γύμνοι, as those wholly stripped of proper and respectable apparel, after having laid aside their vile raiment (see v. 2; Huther's pressing of γύμνοι yields no gain), and destitute of daily food (the different senses in which ἐφήμερος is construed, amount to the same thing), *i. e.* destitute of positive familiarity with the word of God according to Judaistic ideas. The Jewish Christians, to be sure, had progressed so far as not to damn the poor believers (even as the Jews already affected friendliness towards the proselytes of

the gate); they acknowledged the brotherhood in a general way and perchance would unctuously express that acknowledgment in the words "Go in peace," wished them perhaps also all manner of good in the self-satisfying of their (the poor brethren's) Christian wants, but having gone to that stretch of liberality, would also dismiss them, without having any other dealings with them or entering with them into the communion of devoted care and love (just as nowadays the Confessionalists dismiss the Evangelicals with unctuous sour-sweet words). Be warmed! be filled! These words are surely not uttered optatively in the sense, "May some one else help you" (Hottinger, Grotius and al.), nor imperatively in a liberal sense (Huther), but connected with the valedictory salutation of peace they denote a cant-wish of blessing, "may you succeed in getting warmed etc." The reproach of pauperism is at the same time clothed in hypocritically sparing terms, hence "be ye warmed" not at once "be ye clothed" (Laurentius and al.), but alluding to it and in like manner "be ye filled" in allusion to their hunger.—The one who thus speaks represents the general tendency but points to the unctuous speakers who understand to couch the unsparing dismissal as much as possible in fair and sparing language. Instead of such conduct they were one and altogether to show love to the poor. But our example presupposes the case that they did not even give them necessaries.

What would that profit?—See v. 14. Such a benediction (wish-of-blessing) would purely have no value and the acknowledgment of brotherhood on which it is founded would accordingly be equally void, just as the faith on which it is founded. The whole demeanour would be unprofitable *egentibus* (Hottinger) and *dicentibus* (Semler); in general to the kingdom of God.

VER. 17. **So also faith, if it have not.**—If it does not show the life-sigu of animating works, which are intrinsically its property.

For itself. [*i. e. in* itself.—M.]—As it is dead as regards the brethren, so it is dead as regards itself. Καθ' ἑαυτήν not pleonastic (Grotius), not "fides sola" (Knapp), but joined with νεκρά indicative of being dead or rather of having died, whereby the life of faith and consequently the life of the believer himself is denied. And this being dead is not only the cause of this want of works (Olshausen) but also the consequence of the reaction of that want. It dies ever more and more of not being energizing. See Matth. xviii. 23 etc.

The proof of faith by the works of faith or the believer's justification before the consciousness of the Church, vv. 18, 19.

VER. 18. **But some one will say.**—Different explanations are given for the introduction of an objection by ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις, although the sense of the passage especially with the reading χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων is abundantly clear. The possession of faith without works may be asserted but not be proved, since the corresponding works constitute the proof of faith, while the faith may be proved by the right works. The works therefore are the exhibition, the evidence of faith. Difficulties have been found 1. In James' introducing this proposition as the expression of another person and not as his own; 2. in his introducing it by ἀλλά. The second difficulty disappears with the first. James could not well take the place of the objector because it was remote from the mind of his readers to deny the genuineness of his faith; but many among them were inclined to deny it in the case of the Gentile Christians. Hence the sense is as follows: but some one will rise up against this dead faith and with it enter the lists in proving the genuineness of his faith by his works of faith. In this sense the passage has a grand prophetical character. The Gentile Christian world has proved by its works of faith that it had the true faith, but Ebionism with its want of consistency in Christian works of love that its orthodoxism was not a living faith. ἀλλά therefore is here not the formula of a dialectical objection, as in Rom. ix. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 35, but the introduction of an actual historical antithesis, That the speaker's faith (v. 14) is dead is primarily a mystery of an inward state of death, but there will come one who by the exhibition of the contrary will make manifest that death. James makes him express in a definite antithesis what he actually shall do, in order to elucidate the law of life that invisible faith cannot be seen without visible works, while the visible works enable us to see the invisible faith. Wiesinger therefore rightly maintains that the speaker sides with James. On the other hand the artificial explanation of Huther can only be accounted for by the embarrassment he experienced with respect to ἀλλά. "But some might say in answer to what I have just stated, defending himself: *thou* (who hast not the works) hast faith and *I*, on the other hand (who affirm that faith without works is dead), have works; my one-sided insisting upon works is not any more right than thy one-sided insisting upon faith." This, in the first place, would be no defence of the speaker (v. 14), and secondly it is nowhere said that the speaker (v. 18) has no faith; he rather wants to prove his faith by his works. Stier even maintains that the ἔργα ἔχων, who has the word, is a man of pharisaic tendencies who in the interest of work-righteousness impugns faith; but this is altogether beside the connection, for there is no reference whatsoever to pharisaic works. On the other wide-differing but otherwise unimportant explanations given of this passage compare Huther especially with reference to those of Pott, Kern, de Wette and Schneckenburger. It is proper to add that Huther himself farther on gives a tolerably correct paraphrase of this passage and is equally right in remarking that with the reading ἐκ τῶν ἔργων in Text. Rec. these words should be taken ironically.

VER. 19. **Thou believest that God is one.**—The Apostle having shown in what precedes that the existence of faith cannot be proved without works, now proceeds to the proof that faith, even if granted in such a form, has a damnable effect, that is one issuing in fear and terror of God. Huther does not justly state the force of the Apostle's thought in saying that James here shows the inadequateness of faith without works to salvation. For the example of the devils who tremble just in consequence of their manner of believing, not only along with their faith, nor

even notwithstanding their faith, is not simply designed to intensify the negation that such a faith is without salvation. The condition of not being saved is connected with the state of being damned. The Apostle does not start with the concession that the objector has faith (Huther), but that his faith is worthless. Huther thinks it strange that James does not name that which is specifically Christian as the object of faith. On this account Calvin supposed that this, whole section treats not of Christian faith (*de fide*) but only *de vulgari dei notitia*. De Wette holds that ὅτι characterizes the faith as being merely theoretical, in which Wiesinger agrees with him and to which Huther objects without sufficient reason. Huther and al. consider that this article of faith is simply introduced by way of example and that just this article was selected because it distinguishes revealed religion from heathenism (Deut. vi. 4; Neh. ix. 6 etc.). But this suggests the additional remark that it was selected because the Jewish Christians and the Jews not only were particularly proud of this first article of their faith (Schneckenburger), but also were wont to contrast it with the distinctly Christian dogma of the Triune God and the Son of God.—This discloses moreover the further consideration that it was their pride in this increasingly misunderstood article which kept them back as Jews from fully surrendering to Christ and as Jewish Christians from fully surrendering themselves to the Christian faith. The monarchism of the Jews which was opposed to the incarnation of the Son of God continued in the germinating monarchism of the Jewish Christians. In the judgment of James therefore the fruitlessness or worthlessness of that faith is connected with the fact that in the shape of orthodoxism it obstinately remains at a stand-still on a stage of faith which has been laid aside and that in this respect it is a heterodoxy which may become a heresy and ultimately even a devilish antichristianity. It was just by remaining at a stand-still and by resistance offered to the completed revelation that monotheism originally so rich in vitality became dead deism. In a similar way the Greek article of faith has been established in opposition to Roman Catholic development, and the Roman Catholic article in opposition to evangelical faith.* Where vital development is abhorred (*perhorrescirt?*) faith becomes false confidence in the abstract article. Wiesinger justly calls attention to the circumstance that this passage shows that this Epistle is far from being Judaizing and anti-Pauline.

Thou doest well.—It is questionable whether we are to take these words ironically (Calvin, Theile, Wiesinger and many others), or literally (Grotius, de Wette and al). They cannot be purely ironical, because the article is truth; they cannot be purely laudatory, because the true article is falsely held; Huther therefore rightly observes that the ironical lies in the whole expression; that is, in the momentary appearance as if James in conceding to the objector to believe in such a manner were therewith also conceding to him the true faith. "This irony" says Wiesinger "rises into sarcasm in the combination of πιστεύουσι και φρίσσουσι." It may be doubted whether this conclusion is formally sarcastic. The sarcasm lies here in the naked fact itself. Formally it only flashes out in the splendid καὶ which connects the greatest seeming contradiction and which Huther rightly does not like to see wiped off (Theile: *atqui* etc.).

The devils.—Although we must not think of demoniacs (Wetstein), nor of the demons in the demoniacs (Schneckenburger) they furnish the most intelligible historical proof of the otherwise more transcendental declaration. Huther thinks that the reference is to the demons or apostate spirits according to the view which makes the heathen deities demons (LXX. Deut. xxxii. 17 etc.; 1 Cor. x. 20). But the Apostle's saying is perfectly intelligible without such reference, which may easily lead here to confusion. For as far as the demons are the occasion of polytheism they impugn the Unity of God but as far as they are conscious that they are lying and that the *One* God will visit them in judgment, they just appear to acknowledge the pride of Judaism and the defeat of heathenism. Holding fast to this reference we ought to pass on to the thought that heathenism also in its deepest demon-background is not without a monotheistic consciousness, and it is just this which constitutes its misery. To give to this idea a more popular shape it would run thus: the demons which as you hold inhabit and constitute the heathen world, are all monotheists but for that very reason they shudder. But if we emphasize the heathen element, we weaken the marked emphasis of the demon element, and this is the reason why we have doubts concerning said reference. Nor do they shudder *only*, because they expect the judgment, their judgment is already involved in their relation to God. This shuddering φρίσσειν (ἅπαξ λεγ.) is more than trembling (Job iv. 15), a horror with the hair standing on end.—

The two examples of the proof of faith by works as a general example of the unity of living faith of Jews and Gentiles, v. 20–26.

VER. 20. **But willest thou to know (it)?**—These words denote the certainty with which the Apostle announces the convincing proof of the uselessness of faith without works from the Holy Scriptures, the source of all certainty.—The ὦ before ἄνθρωπε intensifies the censure conveyed in the address, "thou empty (not as Baumgarten has it, simply unwise and shortsighted [stupid], but empty as to faith and spirtual strength) man," and which "as applied to persons occurs only here in the New Testament" (Huther). It is not perchance the fiction of an objector but the personification of a mode of thinking which is introduced as an actor, v. 1 etc. and as a speaker in v. 15. The spiritual emptiness of such a man corresponds to the spiritual emptiness or impotence and unproductiveness of his faith. The reading ἀργή (advocated by Wiesinger against Huther) certainly deserves the preference also in respect of the sense because the Apostle passes from the idea of dead faith through the idea of unproductive faith to

* If Lange alludes to the *filioque* in the Nicene Creed it is only proper to remark that the position of the Greek Church is sustained by Oecumenical consent, while the insertion of the *filioque* in the Nicene Creed has never received the sanction of an Oecumenical Council.—M.

the idea of a faith lacking the specific effect of faith (*δικαιοῦσθαι*). [Oecumenius: *κενὸν ἐκάλεσεν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ψιλῇ τῇ πίστει αὐχοῦντα, μηδὲν τῆς διὰ τῶν ἔργων ὑποστάσεως κεκτημένον εἰς πλήρωσιν.* —M.].

VER. 21. **Was not Abraham our father.**—The first example contrasts the father of faith himself with the false orthodoxy-righteousness of Judaism, just as Paul in Rom. iv. contrasts him with their work-righteousness, or more accurately with their pride in circumcision. *Abraham*, the highest theocratical authority, which they share with him.

When he offered Isaac, his son.—In explaining this difficult passage we have to start with the preliminary statement that *δικαιοῦν* (הִצְדִּיק Sept. *δικαιοῦν, δίκαιον κρίνειν*) generally denotes in both Testaments: to *pronounce, declare, set one forth as, righteous* in any forum of justice or judgment, whether in consequence of proved innocence or surrender at discretion, expiation or pardon; although there are passages in the Old Testament in which the sense *to lead to righteousness, to make righteous* predominates, Dan. xii. 3; Is. liii. 11. The most important instances of the former kind of declaring righteous are the following passages: Luke vii. 29: *ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεόν* and 1 Tim. iii. 16; *ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι* (cf. Ex. xxiii. 7; Deut. xxv. 1; Prov. xvii, 15; Is. v. 23; Matth. xii. 37; Rom. ii. 13); instances of the latter kind occur in Rom. iv. 5; iii. 26 etc. The comparison of these different passages shows that to the Old Testament with reference to man belongs especially the idea of *pronouncing the innocent righteous conformably to his innocence*, while to the New Testament belongs that of *pronouncing the sinner righteous conformably to his faith*. Matth. xii. 37 must be carefully distinguished because the last judgment shall be a judgment of the *works* of faith. But even the Old Testament knew already the imputation of faith as righteousness, Gen. xv. 16. We may say therefore that James for the benefit of his readers adopts the language of the Old Testament in allotting to true faith the imputation of righteousness by the *λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, but to the proof of true faith the *δικαιοῦσθαι*. St. Paul, on the other hand, employs the two terms as identical (Rom. iv. 6 etc.; ch. v. 1), although he is well acquainted with the Old Testament meaning of *δικαιοῦσθαι* as applied to a human forum or even to the last judgment (see 1 Cor. iv. 4, 5). Huther, after enumerating the different interpretations of this passage (Calvin: proved righteous before men; Baumgarten: his justification has been ratified before men; Grotius: he was loved as a righteous man etc.), adds "he has been declared righteous;" but this is really saying nothing concerning our passage, for the question is, in which sense? The difference in the report is noteworthy. Gen. xv. 6 we read: Abram "believed in the Lord and He counted it to him for righteousness," without any further mention of an outward declaration of God concerning it. Both to him and to the Scripture the thing is sure in virtue of the testimony of the Spirit. Very different is Gen. xxii. 16, where the proof of Abraham's faith is followed by the the solemn declaration of the angel from heaven, "By myself have I sworn etc." Has not this declaration become a manifest deposit to the house of Abraham and the theocratic posterity? And that this is a decisive element is also evident from the other proof. So also righteousness was imputed to Rahab, the harlot also, not only in the depth of her heart but along with the proof of her faith. She did also experience a *δικαιοῦσθαι* in the congregation of God, Josh. vi. 25; Matth. i. 5. The term *δικαιοῦν* consequently is used by James according to the Old Testament mode of expression in a New Testament deeper sense and denotes that God declares righteous in the theocratical forum before the theocratical congregation conceived as permanent. It is the Divine declaration of the proof of faith in and for the kingdom of God, while the *λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην* of James or the *δικαιοῦν* of Paul describes an act, which transpires solely between God and the sinner in the forum of his consciousness.

Justified by works: *ἐξ ἔργων*.—Although this Plural is selected with reference to the category in question, yet it must also be remembered that the singular work "when he offered his son" was the culminating point which comprehended all the trials of his faith. Huther justly finds this pronouncing righteous in Gen. xxii. 16; but it was not solely contained in the giving of the promise on the ground of that which he had done; he had previously received less developed promises and moreover in connection with acts of well-doing. It was rather contained in the solemn declaration with which God in consequence of Abraham's proof of his faith *now sealed* to him His promise *with an oath*, whereby at the same time *a seal was set to* the consciousness of Abraham. If the distinction which Holy Scripture draws between the degree of *justification* and that of *sealing*, had been better observed, the key to the doctrine of James in its agreement with that of Paul would thereby have also been better preserved (see Jesus Sir. xliv. 20).—

On the altar.—Offering is sacrificing as to its essential element; hence Luther's version "when he sacrificed" is not as wrong as Huther thinks; but the explanation "when he was going to sacrifice" is tautological, unless the term receive the doubtful interpretation of positive *slaughtering*.

Isaac, his son.—Emphatically describing the greatness of the offering as in Gen. xxii. 16.—The example of Abraham, however, has a peculiar significance to the Jewish Christian readers of the Epistle. As Abraham obediently offered to the God of revelation his theocratic offspring with whom the promise seemed to be indissolubly connected, so were they also to learn to distinguish their natural national feelings from the promise of God and offer them for their entrance into the New Covenant.

VER. 22. **Thou seest.**—We read the verse with the majority of commentators as an assertion and not as a question (de Wette, Lachmann and al.). And what then? Not, perchance, that the works were added to his faith, but that faith and works flow forth in one gush of the Spirit and doubly cover each other; faith was actively joined with his works as the foundation,

the works were reactively the completion of his faith.

That faith was working together with his works.—Most commentators perceive here the antithesis, "neither faith was wanting nor the works" (Bengel: *quid utravis pars alteri conferat;* similarly Erasmus etc. Wiesinger.). According to the opposite view the propositions are designed to demonstrate the necessity of works. Thou seest that faith was active in works and had to be completed by works (Estius: *operosa fuit, non otiosa.* Calvin). Huther, "The second hemistich is not in antithesis with the former, but constitutes its complement: faith being active with its works, itself reached its completion." But James evidently does not wish to lay so one-sided an emphasis on the necessity of works; his object is rather to vindicate the unity of both, as is manifest from vv. 18 and 23. Primarily he demanded works as *the proof of faith*, he now demands them also with reference to the ἐδικαιώθη v. 22 as the *completion of faith.* The first proposition therefore stands for the *proof of faith*, although not as demanding the *necessity* of faith which was self-evident to him and to his readers. συνήργει certainly cannot mean "faith was auxiliary in his doing" as Huther rightly observes against Hofmann and Wiesinger; nor hardly, "it was the συνεργός of his works, it operated not by itself but with his works" (Huther), which gives not a clear idea. Kern sought to avoid this dualism by taking τοῖς ἔργοις as Dat. commod., "it operated to the production of his works." σύν joined with the verb may be construed as having *additional* force, *i. e. along with*, but also *intensivo-synthetically, i. e. united to, joined with* (not to mention that it may mean: quite, thoroughly, συντέμνω etc.) Mark xvi. 20 etc. We take the passage in the latter sense thus: "*Faith manifested itself operatively at one with the works.*" Faith aided in the completion of the work and the work aided in the completion of faith.—

Faith was made complete.—ἐτελειώθη is taken by many as completed proof, that is declaratively (Calvin, Bengel etc.), against which rendering Huther with reason insists upon the expression, "it was completed," not in the sense it had been imperfect but that it was consummated in the exercise. But here again we have to remind the reader of the significance of the term τελείωσις in this Epistle (cf. ch. i. 4, 25; iii. 2; v. 11). Abraham by his faith-offering attained typically and ideally the τελείωσις, which the Jewish Christians were to attain by the full proof of Christian love out of [as the ground and source of—M.] faith and with them all Israel was to attain it.

VER. 23. **And [thus] the Scripture was fulfilled.**—That is the passage Gen. xv. 6 here cited from the Sept. (with the exception of δὲ for καί) which gives a passive rendering to the active language of the original. So Paul quotes the LXX. Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 6. James, it is evident from this declaration, was fully cognizant of the predication of that passage concerning Abraham's righteousness of faith and was far from disputing it. But on that account, as Huther rightly maintains, we are unable to adopt the definition of ἐπληρώθη which is given by the majority of commentators, viz.: then was *confirmed*, or that of Hofmann: then was *proved* that God had rightly estimated the faith of Abraham (Wiesinger, "then it was shown (*erwiesen*) that the Scripture was right"). The meaning of πληροῦν forbids such definitions. Moreover, strictly speaking this saying cannot be referred to the written declaration of Holy Scripture but to the Divine act on which that declaration is founded, *i. e.* the λογίζεσθαι, or to the prophetical sense of believing Abraham himself. But, on the other hand, we cannot adopt the exposition of de Wette and Huther, "then was realized," for that righteousness of faith was a reality from the very first. The *fulfilling* denotes throughout the completed, decided and manifested development of a seed of faith which until then was germ-like concealed, whether it be a prophecy or a type (cf. Matth. ii. 15; v. 28 etc.; 1 Kings ii. 27 etc.). That righteousness of faith of Abraham reached its πλήρωσις or τελείωσις in its proof and verification, as it was sealed by the now openly stated Divine testimony. The act of faith itself and the subsequent sealing in the life of individual believers answer to the Old Testament Abráhamic foundation and the New Testament completion. That proof and verification of faith was on its real side τελείωσις, while, on its ideal side viewed as the completion of the prophetical word of the Spirit on which the written word is founded, it was πλήρωσις. And this πλήρωσις was manifested in his being called the friend of God. Not literally but substantially he was honoured with that appellation from the beginning Gen. xxii. 16, and afterwards also was referred to in the Old Testament as the beloved of God 1 Chron. xx. 7; Is. xli. 8. This honourable appellation has developed the epithet "the friend of God" among the Jews and the Mohammedans (Wolf's *curæ*, and Theile.) ["*El-Khalil-Allah*" or, as he is more usually called, "*El-Khalil*," simply "the friend," "is a title which has in Mussulman countries superseded altogether his own proper name." Stanley's *Jewish Church* p. 14. "Abraham is the Zoroaster of the Semitic race; but he is more than Zoroaster, in proportion as his sense of the Divine was more spiritual, and more free from the philosophy of nature and the adoration of the visible world." Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, II., 88. See also Max Müller's Essay on *Semitic Monotheism* in the London Times of April 14 and 15, 1860.—M.]. "In Gen. xviii. 17 the LXX. add the words τοῦ παιδός μου to ἀπὸ 'Αβραάμ, for which Philo substitutes τοῦ φίλου μου." Huther. Hofmann defines the expression "*the friend of God*," by "*who* loved God," while Huther disputes that definition and gives the opposite one "*whom* God loved." But both entangle themselves in a false antithesis. The friend is at once loving and loved and indissolubly so. And although it remains a fixed fact that Abraham's love was the consequence of God's love to him, it is also evident that Abraham's good conduct, that is his self-sacrificing love, is intended to be brought out. But he was not only made "the friend of God" (Grotius ἐκλήθη=*factus est*), but he was called and honoured as such. And this was the way in which he was ἐδικαιώθη for the kingdom of God. Wiesinger's assertion is therefore incorrect that δικαιοῦσθαι refers to righteousness before God and not (as Calov and al.) to right-

eousness before men. But this "righteousness before men" requires to be defined in the manner indicated above.

VER. 24. **Ye see that by works a man is justified.** *Out of* (ἐξ ἐργων) *works.*—The preposition is not interrogative (Griesbach), nor imperative (Erasmus), but indicative (Luther). Recollecting that δικαιοῦται here as in v. 21 does not refer to justification by faith before God, but to the proof of faith before the congregation or the forum of the kingdom of God (in the sense of being declared righteous to the world, cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16), the seeming opposition of this passage to Rom. iii. 28 and al. is set aside. *Per se* therefore μόνον might be connected with δικαιοῦται thus "not only by faith but by works a man is justified," but firstly this would not give a pure antithesis as in v. 18, and secondly, the preposition v. 26 could then not follow. μόνον therefore must be joined adjectively with πίστεως in the sense of *bare* faith, faith without works (so Theophylact, Grotius, Wiesinger, Huther and al. cf. 1 Cor. xii. 31; 2 Cor. xi. 23 and other passages).

VER. 25. **But likewise, Rahab, the harlot.** —δέ indicates the contrast between the two examples, ὁμοίως their similarity. The contrast comes out strongly in the fact that Rahab was a harlot. The Article denotes that she was the historically known personage without intensifying the idea which however must not be weakened by the exposition "hospita" (Lyranus) or "idolatra" although she was both in reality (Rosenmüller). But the circumstance that she was a Gentile is implied. The supposition of de Wette and al. that this example was chosen with polemical reference to Heb. xi. 31, because there she is praised on account of her faith, Wiesinger rejects with the appropriate observation that there as here it is the work-proof of her faith which is rendered prominent, as indeed the whole chapter (Heb. xi) lauds faith as the power of conduct well pleasing to God. Wiesinger (following Calvin) also brings out the real motive for the selection of this example. To the example of Abraham, who was the prototype of all true faith, is now added another as remote from it as possible, "that of a woman, a Canaanite, a harlot." The Apostle's motive, however, must be taken even more concretely. Doubtless Rahab stands here as the representative of Gentile Christians in their works of faith. Just as Abraham by the sacrifice of Isaac, from being a Jew, hedged in by his nationality, became the patriarch of the spiritual Israel, a pattern to the Jewish Christian readers of this Epistle, so the case of Rahab is an example drawn from the Old Testament of the ability of Gentiles becoming by means of their work of faith the spiritual companions of Abraham and his children. Now she was justified not only in that her life was spared (Josh. ii. 6, 22 etc.) but in that she became a highly honoured mother in Israel, as tradition informs us (Matth. i. 5).

When she received the messengers.— One might always think that James selected the word ἄγγελοι instead of κατάσκοποι (Heb. xi. 31) in allusion to the circumstance that the Gentiles of his time were so ready to receive the messengers of the Gospel. Although the ὑπό of the verb may not have the secondary meaning "clam excipere," (Theile) still it suitably intensifies the idea. She hospitably received the messengers and sheltered them, she received them forthwith, as the Gentiles received the messengers of the Gospel rejected and persecuted by the Jews.

And sent them forth by another way.— Cf. Josh. ii. 15. It is not simply that she let them go, but that she thrust them off with saving haste and effort, as it were by force. So Festus the Gentile sent Paul to Rome in order to deliver him from the persecutions of the Jews and so for a time the Roman rulers in general, but especially believing Gentiles protected the messengers of the Gospel from the fanaticism of the Jews. The way of the deliverance of the messengers, however, was not only another way, but an uncommon one (ἑτέρᾳ ὁδῷ [*i. e.* διὰ τῆς θυρίδος.—M.]).

VER. 26. **For as the body without spirit.** —The spirit can only describe the constant, inward vital principle (and in its actuality), which gives motion to the living body. Consequently not the soul as a quiescent substance, nor that which animates (Wiesinger), and still less the πνεῦμα as "halitus" (Piscator and al.). The spirit in its actuality is the ἐνέργεια of the body, without which it is dead. By comparison therefore faith is dead without (corresponding) works. It is an unnatural condition for the body to exist without spirit; consequently the reference here is to a faith which has passed into an unnatural condition. James, therefore, cannot mean that works must be added to faith; he rather sees in *the* works (with the Article), the collective phenomenon, that form of life which renders visible the vitality of faith, its animating *energy* (although not absolutely love, as Theile maintains) or *entelechy*. The seeming inconcinnity of the figure, to which Huther calls attention, that while on the one hand, the body is visible and the spirit invisible, faith on the other is invisible and the works visible, disappears if it is remembered that the spirit also in virtue of its actuality effects the higher visibility of the body. Being dead and being alive is the decisive antithesis, in which, however, the separate members also are brought into comparison. James is therefore far from forming a dualistic conception of real faith, he rather takes it *really* as a productive power much as Aristotle does the idea, and with reference to public proof he will recognize it only in its expression by works which almost recalls Hegel's idea that the true in the individual authenticates itself in its process of development as fact.

James's doctrine of faith in this chapter in relation to the doctrine in Rom. iii. 28; *Gal.* ii. 16, *and al.* —We refer in the first place to the Introduction, to the foregoing exegesis, to our exposition in the History of the Apostolic Age, I., p. 171; and in the next place to Huther, p. 126, and the Supplement to his Commentary, p. 208. Huther, with reason enumerates three views. 1. James and Paul agree in thought but differ in expression. This was the prevalent view before the Reformation, and in modern times the view of Neander, Thiersch, Wiesinger, Huther, etc. 2. The doctrine of James contradicts that of Paul. So Luther, de Wette, Kern, Baur, Schwegler. 3. There is certainly a difference in doctrine of

subordinate importance yet without prejudicing their higher unity. So Schmid (*Bibl. Theol.*), Lechler, Weizsäcker (see the last supplement in Huther, also the controversy with Weiss and Weizsäcker, p. 130, 131). Ad 1. Theophylact and others. The ἔργα are different in both instances, Paul mentions the *opera legis*, James the "*opera fidei.*" "This is also right," as Huther correctly observes. *Paul* deals with the ergism of the Jews, *James* with their orthodoxism. Huther moreover urges with reason that Paul does not attribute justifying power to the *opera fidei*. A second distinction in the idea of πίστις was therefore necessary. This has been pointed out by Oecumenius, Neander and al.; viz. "that James takes faith *per se* simply as the mere *notitia*, the considering things as true etc." It is evident that he knows such a kind of faith but it is equally certain that he does not acknowledge it as living faith; not any more than Paul, who was equally familiar with Jewish orthodoxy according to Rom. x, but insisted with equal firmness, that faith must work by love or authenticate itself by works (Gal. v. 6). Wiesinger (with whom Huther agrees), however, is right in maintaining against Schmid, Olshausen, Neander and al., that it is one thing to say "to become righteous by (out of) faith authenticated (proved) in works," and another "to become righteous by works in which faith authenticates itself." This brings us to the third and most important distinction, the different senses of δικαιοῦσθαι. Here Wiesinger and Huther also go asunder. Wiesinger (in connection with Hofmann) maintains that man, having been justified by faith, becomes personally righteous by his works in which faith authenticates itself: that justification in relation to God becomes a justification according to a man's behaviour towards God. Huther, on the other hand, holds that by δικαιοῦν Paul describes that declaring righteous or free [*i. e.* from guilt and punishment, German *Freisprechen*—M.] on the part of God which puts the believer into the new filial relation to God, whereas James understands by it that declaring righteous or free on the part of God in virtue of which the man regenerated into a child of God receives in the judgment σωτηρία. But the two views are not quite clear. In the first the idea of the forum is wanting, where the δικαιοῦσθαι is to take place, in the second the forum of the last judgment is improperly anticipated. It is of course understood, that according to Paul also, men will be judged in the last day with reference to their fruits of faith (2 Cor. v. 10), but in *that* judgment Abraham also has not yet stood, whereas on the other hand righteousness of faith and σωτηρία along with it, are acquired only in an ideal judgment. But between the first Divine forum in a repenting conscience and the last forum in the judgment of the world there lies as a middle forum the public attestation of the believer in the consciousness of the theocratic congregation; outwardly to the Church an authentication, inwardly to believers a sealing. By the selection of the term, therefore, James wished the Jewish Christians to understand that with the Church he could not acknowledge them as believers, if they were lacking the full consistency of Christian deeds.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Both according to James and Paul (Rom. i. 16, 17) the doctrine of the sinner's justification before God is one of the principal doctrines of the Gospel. The question of the true Israelite "What shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" (Matth. xix. 16; Mark x. 17; Luke x. 25), rightly considered, is the most vital question for every sinner desirous of salvation. It is so much the more melancholy that the dispute concerning the doctrine of justification by faith (out of faith), or of justification by (out of) works has in every century of the Christian era given rise to so much misunderstanding and called forth so many attempts to show that James and Paul are irreconcilably contradicting one another. How little the doctrine of the one differs from that of the other, if we understand the meaning which each attaches to the terms *faith*, *works* and *justify*, has been sufficiently illustrated in the exegesis of this passage. See "Exegetical and Critical."—Considering this, we cannot but regard the well-known opinion of Luther on the *epistola straminea*, which is partly based on James' doctrine of justification, as the fruit of an unfortunate misunderstanding. Nor do we find in these propositions of James any positive opposition to the doctrine of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. But we hold it to be very conceivable that Paul's doctrine of justification was either involuntarily misunderstood or designedly perverted into an excuse for the flesh by the readers of the Epistle of James and that he was on that account constrained powerfully to oppose those who degraded the doctrine of grace into a cloak of sin. He therefore contends not against Paul but against a one-sided Paulinism, which in some hands might easily turn into unchristian Antinomianism and an unholy spirit of emancipation. Both James and Paul are well entitled to a hearing and every view or consideration of the way of salvation, which silences the one at the expense of the other, is decidedly unfair. Paul's preaching is glad tidings to all who are conscious of the absolute impossibility of being saved by their own virtue and strength, and the exhortation of James is a wholesome corrective for all who are apt to forget what Paul himself did teach that true faith must work by love (Gal. v. 6). Paul sets into prominent relief the great antithesis of *grace* and *sin*, James (as well as our Lord, Jno. xiii. 17) that of *knowing* and *doing*.

2. It is of the utmost importance that while, on the one hand, *justification* and *sanctification* must be distinguished the one from the other, on the other hand the one must never be separated from the other. The true preaching of the Gospel involves the necessity of Christ in all His fulness being set forth both *in* us and *for* us. If *justification* and *sanctification* are confounded, or if the latter is made the *foundation* of the former we open the door to *self-righteousness;* if *justification* and *sanctification* are separated, we deliver an open passport to *injustice*. The true union of the "for us" and the "in us" requires that justification be put first, but that sanctification be neither put in the background nor in the foreground.

3. What James says concerning the faith of the devils (v. 19) is important on several considerations 1. As affording proof of the existence of personal, self-conscious evil spirits. 2. As affording proof of their original goodness and communion with God, which consequently shuts out indirectly all reference to dualism in the question of the origin of moral evil. 3. As affording proof of the infinite misery of the fallen angels; to have a faith which yields no consolation but only excites terror and shuddering, must probably be the highest degree of misery. 4. As indicating the low and sad standpoint occupied by one who confesses the Gospel without the exhibition of love-working Christianity; his standpoint is not Christian but devilish.

The way of acquiring the favour and friendship of God in all great essential features was virtually the same under the Old Covenant as under the New. The example of Abraham, in particular (Gen. xv. 1–6), which is also used by Paul (Rom. iv.) exhibits this unity of the way of salvation under both Testaments in the clearest manner.

5. The case of Rahab, the harlot, who is introduced as a pattern to the believers in Christ Jesus (cf. also Heb. xi. 31), affords a striking proof that God exalts the mean and regards the miserable and exhibits a lofty memorial of the spiritual emancipation and exaltation of woman by Christianity. It is wonderful that just the most fallen and disgraced women of the Old Testament are preferred to honour in the New. Do not even Thamar and Bathsheba shine in the genealogy of our Lord? Matth. i.

6. "Whatever is transitory is only a similitude." Nature the symbol of grace, the body permeated by the spirit the figure of living and active faith, but the cold corpse also is the representative of a merely outward form of spiritual life, from which life itself has vanished.

7. "If James calls faith without works a dead faith, he surely cannot mean that the works, the outward and the visible render faith living and that they constitute the life of faith but he had to presume that true faith includes [carries within itself] life, the animating principle, from which the works must emanate, and that this must make itself known in the works. He considers the want of works as proof of the want of vital faith and therefore he calls such faith a dead faith." Neander.

8. Luther (in his Exposition of 2 Pet. Ed. Irmischer, Vol. LXX., p. 223 sq.) excellently says concerning the fruits of faith: "although they belong to our neighbour, in order that they may redound to his benefit, yet does that fruit not fail *because it makes faith stronger.*—It is therefore altogether a very different strength than bodily strength for it decreases and is consumed; but this spiritual strength, the more we exercise and practise it, the stronger it grows, and it decreases if it is not practised."

[V. 14. On the error which James combats, compare the following passage from Tertullian ('de Poenit' c. 5): "Some persons imagine that they have God if they receive Him in their heart and mind and do little for Him in act; and that therefore they may commit sin, without doing violence to faith and fear; or in other words that they may commit adulteries, and yet be chaste, and may poison their parents, and yet be pious! At the the same rate they who commit sin and yet are godly, may also be cast into hell and yet be pardoned! But such minds as these are offshoots from the root of hypocrisy and sworn friends of the evil one."

V. 16. There is *opus fidei*, the work of faith; *fides quæ operatur*, faith that worketh; *that* is St. Paul's faith (1 Thess. i. 3; Gal. v. 6), and faith that can *show itself* by working, that is St. James's faith (ii. 18). And without works it is but a dead faith, the carcase of faith; there is no spirit in it. No spirit, if no work; *spectrum est, non spiritus:* a flying shadow it is, a spirit it is not, if work it do not. Having wherewith to do good, if you do it not, talk not of faith, for you have not faith in you, if you have wherewith to show it and show it not. Andrewes.

V. 20. Beveridge (on Art. 12 "of good works"): "Though it be for our faith only, and not for our works that God accepts us, yet our works as well as faith are acceptable unto God, yea, and they necessarily spring out from a true and lively faith, so that it is as impossible there should be true faith without good works, as that there should be good works without true faith; for as without faith our works are bad, so without works our faith is dead. And therefore a true faith may be as evidently known by its works, as a tree is clearly discerned by its fruit [Article 12 of the Articles of Religion established in the Church of England and Prot. Episc. Church in the United States reads as follows: "Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God's judgment: yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit."—M.]. If I see fruit growing upon a tree, I know what tree it is, upon which such fruit grows. And so if I see how a man lives, I know how he believes. If his faith be good, his works cannot but be good too; and if his works be bad, his faith cannot but be bad too; for wheresoever there is a justifying faith there are also good works, and wheresoever *there are no good works there is no justifying faith.*" To this last statement Wordsworth adds the following judicious modification. "Suppose the case of a person who has been baptized, and has a *lively faith* and earnest resolve to serve God, and that he is suddenly taken away from this life, without having time to show his faith by his works. Or suppose the case of an *infant* dying after baptism. Then *Faith saves.* No man can do *good* works without Faith; but faith without works saves a man, if God thinks it fit to remove him out of this life, without giving him time for working, and if God knows that he *would* have worked, if he had had time for working. Indeed in such a case *Faith* itself *is work;* according to our Lord's saying, This is the *work* of God, that ye believe on Him, whom He sent" (Jno. vi. 28, 29).

V. 25. Wordsworth. "Rahab received the spies, who were sent before Joshua, the type of Jesus, and who were types of the Apostles of Christ, and hearkened to their message and sent

them forth in speed (ἐκβαλοῦσα) by a cord, by *another way* (other than that by which *they had come*), viz. *by the window*, from which she tied the scarlet cord by which they were let down (Josh. ii. 15–18), and thus obtained deliverance for herself and family by her faith, when her city was destroyed. Thus she was an example very applicable to those whom St. James addressed, who, by receiving the Gospel preached by the Apostles, might escape the woes impending on Jerusalem, as she escaped those which fell upon Jericho (cf. Heb. xi. 31), and who would be overwhelmed in that destruction, if they neglected so great salvation."—M.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Christian utility-principle.—Faith without works.—A faith that cannot save us, cannot possibly be the true faith.—Love the touchstone of faith.—Pious works behind which lurks not seldom hardness of heart.—Those who unwittingly communicate to other their temporal goods prove thereby that they received of their God only little or nothing of spiritual goods.—The contention of dead and living faith.—Unfruitful monotheism.—The faith of devils in its infinite diversity 1, from the faith of good angels and 2, from the faith of believing Christians.—Abraham the true friend of God: 1. God calls and Abraham obeys, 2. God promises and Abraham confides, 3. God tries and Abraham stands fast.—The friendship of God compared with the friendship of the world. What the friend of God shuns, enjoys and expects. Why is it just faith, provided it be living and active, which makes the sinner so well-pleasing to God? Answer: 1. Because of the honour it gives to God, 2. because of the struggle it costs us, 3. because of the fruit it bears for the benefit of others.—Rahab, the harlot of Jericho a guide to the heavenly Jerusalem.—What the sight of a corpse suggests to a believer of the Gospel.—According to James also the sinner is justified not *propter, sed per fidem*.

On the Pericope. Commendation of a living faith; 1. The sense in which James exhorts us thereto, 2. The connection of his doctrine with the doctrine of the Gospel, and in particular with that of Paul. 3. The importance it will always have and has now. *a.* There are men who have neither faith nor works; *b.* others who have works without faith; *c.* others again who have faith without works; and *d.* many whose faith and works leave much to be wished for. For each one of these diseases and one-sidednesses the ever-repeated consideration of James' doctrine is wholesome medicine.

STARKE:—To boast of faith without having it, is very common, Tit. i. 16.—Neither true faith nor true love consists in bare words, 1 Jno. iii. 17, 18.—We usually refer the poor to the Providence of God and it is just this Providence that refers them to us, 1 Tim. vi. 18.—A rich man ought to rejoice in being God's hand, whereby to do good to the poor;—Prov. iii. 27, 28.—Saving faith is not either dead or living, but it is only and always living and this is properly true faith; whereas dead faith is properly not true but false faith. But apart from the article of justification both agree in this respect, that just as true and living faith consists of three parts, viz. knowledge, assent and trust, so false and dead faith consists of these three parts but its knowledge is only historical, its assent only human and its trust only carnal or a conceit of God's grace drawn in carnal assurance, Matth. vii. 21, 22; Luke xiii. 25.—Works are not the life or soul of faith but only an infallible mark of the same, Heb. xi. 8, 17.—The devils believe and know in particular four articles of our faith, Matth. viii. 2, 9. They know 1. that there is a God, 2. that there is a Christ, 3. that there will be a final judgment, 4. that they will then be tortured. But this knowledge does not minister to their peace and salvation, but to their alarm and damnation.

HEDINGER:—If true faith consists only in knowledge and outward assent, the devil also is a believer and consequently blessed, 1 Jno. ii. 3, 4.

LUTHER:—Not fear and terror, but joy, peace and consolation in the conscience work true faith, Rom. v. 1.

QUESNEL:—Even the devil is not an atheist; what then are we to think of those who boast that they believe nothing and are not afraid of anything? Ps. xiv. 1.—Some hope to be saved by a faith which does less to them than the faith of devils, Job xxi. 12, 18.

LANGII OP.:—The emptier a vessel, the more does it sound and resound; just so the hypocrite who lacks faith, Ps. xciv. 4.

QUESNEL:—Works live by faith as by the spirit which animates them, Rom. xiv. 23.

LUTHER:—Works do not make us righteous but cause us to be declared righteous, Luke xvii. 9, 10.—All the world has admired the offering of Abraham; what may not come to pass, since God has offered His own Son? Rom. v. 8; viii. 32.—Faith is the mother who gives birth to the virtues, as her children.

STARKE:—All true believers are the friends of God and this is the peculiar prerogative of believers of the New Testament, Jno. xv. 14, 15.—The faith of converted Jews and Gentiles is uniform, Acts xv. 19.—The grace of God does not charge us with past transgressions, if we are converted, 1 Tim. i. 13.—The weak faith of a Rahab must be as active as the most perfect faith of Abraham, Rom. iv. 19, 20.

LANGII OP.:—This is the only right and safe way to seek righteousness, which enables us to stand before God, solely by faith in Christ out of His merit so that that faith be also actively shown by love, Phil. iii. 9; Gal. v. 6.

HEUBNER:—Unfruitfulness betrays the ungenuineness of faith.—Love never complains of want of ability; the stronger love, the greater the ability.—Dead faith is no faith.

AUGUSTINE:—Such faith is a palsied hand.—The faith of Abraham was imputed to him for righteousness, before it had brought forth works, but it was a living faith, in which the works lay as to the germ.—Works *per se* are not the spirit, but the faith moving in the works, is spirit.

VON GERLACH:—What James calls faith without works is properly speaking no faith at all; not any more than a love which deals only in pleasant words, is love (v. 15).—Paul opposes

the antithesis of dead work-holiness, James the antithesis of a pharasaic pride in empty intellectual knowledge.—Paul met the Pharisees with precisely the same argument, cf. Rom. ii. 6–11; xiii. 27.—Man is not justified by (out of) faith separable from works, not any more than fire (*e. g.* painted fire) separable from heat and light is able to warm and light us.

LUTHER:—O, faith is a lively, busy active thing, so that it is impossible for it not to be ceaselessly working good! It does not ask either if good works are to be done, but before it asks, it has done them and is ever doing. But whoso doeth not such works, is an unbelieving man, gropes and looks out for faith and good works, and neither knows what is faith nor what are good works, but for all chatters and talks much of faith and good works. Faith is a living, well-weighed assurance of the grace of God, so sure, that he would a thousand times die for it, and such assurance and knowledge of Divine grace renders men glad, daring and merry before God and all creatures, which is the work of the Holy Ghost in faith. Hence man becomes without constraint ready and glad to serve everybody, to suffer many things to the praise of God and from love of God who has been so gracious to him, so that it is impossible to separate works from faith, yea as impossible as it is to separate burning and shining from fire.

STIER:—James by no means affirms that works give life to, produce or create faith; for faith comes by the power of the word, entering into and received by us and by nothing else. But faith grows complete in works, that is the same as Paul's saying or rather the Lord's saying to Paul, that the strength of God may be completed in weakness (2 Cor. xii. 9). The strength of faith, indwelling from the beginning and already received along with the first seizing of grace, becomes fully proved, verified and its operation completed. Thus our calling and election are made sure in the diligence of living and doing (2 Pet. i. 10). Thus Abraham's first call was made sure in his last works and the word concerning justification by (out of) faith already before accorded to him, was lawfully and actually confirmed as a truth.

VIEDEBANDT:—A faith which helps not our neighbour, neither helps ourselves, for it has not helped us to love.—Before faith are the tears of Peter and after faith the following after of Paul.

JAKOBI:—A sacred author tells us of true faith that it is the firm confidence of things hoped for. But the faith of the devils is an assurance not of what they hope for, but of what they fear.

PORUBSZKY:—Dead faith cannot save. This is evident 1. from the being of blessedness, 2. from the nature of dead, 3. from the experience of daily life.—Living faith justifies and saves (Reformation-Sermon). Cf. art. 20 of the Augsburg Confession.

LISCO:—Faith and works.—Operative faith justifies us before God.—True Christian faith a sanctifying power of life.

[V. 17. HALL:—As that is a vain and idle charity, which bids a man be warm and filled, yet gives him nothing to feed or warm him with, so is that a vain and dead faith, which, professing an adherence to God, yet is severed from all good works and is void of charity.—M.].

[V. 21. HAMMOND:—Abraham was the father of the faithful, the great example of faith and justification; but it was not upon his bare belief of God's promise that he was justified, but upon that high act of obedience to God, in being ready to offer up his only son, in whom the promises were made to him.—M.].

[V. 23. ADAM CLARKE:—As among friends everything is common, so God took Abraham into intimate communion with Himself, and poured out upon Him the choicest of His blessings; for as God can never be in want, because He possesses all things, so Abraham, His friend, could never be destitute, because God was his friend.—M.].

[V. 24. HORNE:—In this instance of the father of the faithful, as in a common centre, are the doctrines of both Apostles met: one says a man is justified by faith working; the other by working faith; and this is really and truly all the difference between them.—M.].

[V. 26. BRIGHT:—Justification then by faith, or according to the Christian doctrine as opposed to the law, must be that all men being sinners are justified, and particularly receive remission of sins, the Holy Spirit, and everlasting salvation, from the free and undeserved goodness of God; upon the consideration of the perfect righteousness and the meritorious sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and upon the condition or qualification of a pious temper of heart for the future, to obey the will of God, and consequently to do what is right and just in whatsoever way He is pleased to declare it, but particularly as it is declared by the Lord Jesus Christ: which same condition too we had never been able to perform without the assistance of the grace of God.—M.].

[TAYLOR:—Let a man believe all the revelations of God; if that belief ends in itself and goes no further, it is like physic taken to purge the stomach; if it do not work, it is so far from bringing health, that itself is a new sickness.—M.].

[EPIPHANIUS:—Faith hath in it the image of godliness engraven and infidelity hath the character of wickedness and prevarication.—M.].

[SALVIANUS:—*Hominem fideliter Christo credere est fidelem Deo esse, h. e. fideliter in Dei mandata servare.*"—M.].

[LACTANTIUS:—"*Christianorum omnis religio sine scelere et macula vivere.*"—M.].

[TAYLOR:—There are but three things that make the integrity of Christian faith; believing the words of God, confidence in His goodness, and keeping His commandments.—Believing is the least thing in a justifying faith; for faith is a conjugation of many ingredients, and faith is a covenant, and faith is a law, and faith is obedience, and faith is a work, and indeed it is a sincere cleaving to and closing with the terms of the Gospel in every instance, in every particular.—M.].

[Compare also on v. 23. JOHN HOWE, Friendship with God, 10 Sermons. Works, 8, 376.—v. 24. TAYLOR, Faith working by love. Sermons. —BULL, *Doctrina D. Jacobi de justificatione ex operibus explanatur et defenditur*, Works, 3, 1.—M.].

VI. FOURTH ADMONITION WITH REFERENCE TO THE FOURTH FORM OF TEMPTATION—PROPAGANDISM.

CAUTION AGAINST THE JUDAISTIC BIAS TO FANATICAL ACTIVITY OF TEACHING. REFERENCE TO THE POWER OF THE TONGUE AND TO THE DEPRAVITY, LICENCE AND DUPLICITY OF THE FANATICALLY EXCITED TONGUE. THE CONTRAST OF FALSE AND TRUE WISDOM IN SPEECH ACCORDING TO THEIR OPPOSITE OPERATIONS.

Chapter III.

My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater con-
2 demnation. For in many things we offend all. If any man offend not in word, the
3 same *is* a perfect man, *and* able also to bridle the whole[1] body. Behold[2], we put bits
in the horses' mouths, that they may obey us; and[3] we turn about their whole body.
4 Behold also the ships, which though *they be* so great, and *are* driven of fierce winds[4], yet
are they turned about with a very small helm, whithersoever[5] the governor listeth[6].
5 Even so the tongue is a little member, and boasteth great things[7]. Behold, how great a
6 matter a little[8] fire kindleth! And the tongue[9] *is* a fire, a world of iniquity: so[10] is the
tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and[11] setteth on fire the
7 course of nature[12]; and it is set on fire of hell. For every kind of beasts, and of birds,
and of serpents, and of things in the sea, is tamed, and hath been tamed of mankind:
8 But the tongue can no man tame[13]; *it is* an unruly[14] evil, full of deadly poison.
9 Therewith bless we God[15], even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are
10 made after the similitude of God. Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and
11 cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be. Doth a fountain send forth
12 at the same place sweet *water* and bitter? Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive
berries[16]? either a vine, figs? so *can* no fountain both yield salt water and fresh[17].
13 Who *is* a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him show out of a
14 good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom. But if ye have bitter envying
15 and strife in your hearts[18], glory not, and lie not against the truth[19]. This wisdom
16 descendeth not from above, but *is* earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and
17 strife *is*, there[20] *is* confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from
above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, *and* easy to be entreated, full of mercy and
18 good fruits, without partiality, and[21] without hypocrisy. And the fruit of[22] righteous-
ness is sown in peace of them that make peace.

Verse 1. Lange: Become not many teachers, my brethren, since ye know, that we shall [as such] receive a greater [a more severe] condemnation [judicial sentence.]
[.... knowing that we shall receive greater condemnation.—M.]

Verse 2. [[1] Cod. Sin. has δυνάμενος for δυνατός.—M.]
Lange: For manifoldly we offend all; if a man offendeth not in word *he* is a perfect man, able even to bridle the whole body.
[For oftentimes we all offend .... word, this man is a perfect man, able to bridle also the whole body.—M.]

Verse 3. [[2] Rec. reads ἰδού against the most authentic codd. C. and Griesbach read ἴδε. A. B. G. Sin. and al. Lachmann and Tisch. have εἰ δέ. [So Alford, Wordsw. *Ecce enim*, Syr. *Si autem*, Vulg.—M.]
[[3] B. C. εἰς τό. [So Cod. Sin. Alf. Rec. πρὸς with A. K. L. (?)—M.]
Lange: But if we put bits into the horses' mouths, in order that they may obey us, we guide also their whole body.
[...... the bits into the mouths of horses in order to their obeying us, we also turn about their whole body.—M.]

Verse 4. [4] [ἀνέμων σκληρῶν. B. C. K. Cod. Sin. σκληρ. ἀνέμ. Rec. A. L.—M.]
[5] [ὅπου ἄν Rec.—ὅπου Sin. B.—M.]
[6] [Cod. Sin. B read βούλεται for βούληται.—M.]
Lange: Behold even the ships, although they are so great and are [moreover] tossed about by fierce winds, even they are guided with a very small rudder, whithersoever the direction [course] of the steersman [guide] may wish.
[.. though so great and driven by ... are turned about by a very small rudder, whithersoever the will of the steersman may wish.—M.]

Verse 5. [7] The reading μεγάλα αὐχεῖ A. C.* recommended by Tischend. is preferable to μεγαλαυχεῖ.
[8] The difference between ἡλίκον and ὀλίγον keeps balancing between the authorities and the critics. In point of sense both amount to the same thing with the exception that ἡλίκον, the more difficult reading, gives also the stronger expression: what a fire, *i. e.* what a little fire. [ἡλίκον is decidedly the more authentic reading. It is in A.** B. C.* Cod. Sin. Vulg. received by Lachmann, Tisch., Alford, Wordsw., de Wette, Huther and others. Alford maintains that ἡλίκος is "*quantulus*" as well as "*quantus*" and cites Lucian, Hermot. 5.—M.]
Lange: Thus also the tongue is a little member and boasteth great things.—Behold what a little fire—what a forest it doth kindle [Jerusalem on fire.]
[... Behold how small a fire kindleth how great a forest.—M]

Verse 6. [9] [Cod. Sin. omits καὶ before γλῶσσα.—M.]
[10] οὕτως before the second ἡ γλῶσσα is wanting in [A. B. C. K. Cod. Sin.—M.]
[11] [Cod. Sin. reads καὶ σπιλοῦσα for ἡ σπιλοῦσα. Rec. and many others.—M.]
[12] [Cod. Sin reads ἡμῶν after γενέσεως.—M.]
Lange: The tongue also is a fire; it, the world [the adornment of the world, worldliness [Germ.: "*Weltförmigkeit*"] of unrighteousness. The tongue steppeth forth [rules] among our members, it, which defileth the whole body and inflameth the [revolving] wheel of the development of life, and itself is inflamed by hell.
[And the tongue is a fire, that world of iniquity. The tongue makes itself in our members the polluter of the whole body [Wordsworth], and setteth on fire the wheel of nature, and itself is set on fire by hell.—M.]

Verse 7. Lange: For every nature of the wild beasts and of the birds, of the creeping creatures and of sea-creatures is tamed and hath been tamed by human nature.
[..... of beasts and birds [lit. *winged things*], of creeping things and things in the sea. . . . .—M.]

Verse 8. [13] [δύναται δαμάσαι ἀνθρώπων. Cod. Sin. A. K.—M.]
[14] ἀκατάστατον is on good grounds preferred by Lachm. Tisch. according to A. B. Vulg. and Cod. Sin. to ἀκατάσχετον, Rec. C. G. K.
Lange: But the tongue no one of men is able to tame, the [causing restlessness and disquiet; Germ: "*unruhstiftend*"—] evil full of death-bringing poison.
[. . . it is a restless evil, full of death-bringing poison.—M.]

Verse 9. [15] A. B. G. Tisch. Lachm. [and Cod. Sin] read τὸν κύριον.
Lange: With it praise [bless] we the Lord and Father [also as Father] and with the same curse we men, who after the image [similitude] of God are created [have become, destined to become His children.]
[Therewith bless we the Lord and Father, and therewith . . . . . . have been created after the likeness of God.—M.]

Verse 10. Lange: . . . praising and cursing.
[. . . goeth forth [Stier, de Wette, Allioli and al.]—M.]
Lange: It shall not be thus, my brethren, that these things come thus to pass.

Verse 12. [16] οὕτως is opposed by the most important witnesses. The immediate sequel in Text. Rec. becomes modified into οὔτε ἁλυκὸν γλυκὺ ποιῆσαι ὕδωρ. Cod. Sin. favours οὕτως etc. [Syr. "*ita etiam aqua salsa non fieri potest dulcis.*"—M.]
[17] [Cod. Sin. omits καὶ before γλυκὺ.—M.]
Lange: Doth the fountain, perchance, bubble out of the same opening sweet and bitter [water]? A fig-tree, my brethren, surely cannot produce olives, or the vine figs? [Thus] nor can [any fountain] salt [water] give sweet water.
[Doth a fountain, perchance, out of the same chink [Alford] send forth the sweet and the bitter? Can a fig-tree, my brethren, yield olives . . . , nor can salt [water] yield sweet water.—M.]

Verse 13. Lange: Who is wise and intelligent among you? Let him show through good conduct his works [that is] in gentleness of wisdom.
[. . . intelligent among you [Bengel, Stier, de Wette, al] . . . out of a good conversation his works in meekness of wisdom.—M.]

Verse 14. [18] [Cod. Sin. ταῖς καρδ.—M.]
Lange: But if ye harbor bitter zeal and quarrelsomeness in your hearts, boast not yourselves. . .
[But if ye harbor bitter emulation and party-strife . . . boast not.—M.]
[19] [Cod. Sin. κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ψεύδεσθε.—M.]

Verse 15. Lange: For this wisdom is not that which cometh down from above, but an earthly, sensuous [soulish (Germ. *seelisch*, almost impossible to render in English without a circumlocution), passionate], devilish one.
[This wisdom is not that which is coming from above, but earthly, sensuous, devilish.—M.]

Verse 16. [20] [Cod. Sin. has καὶ after ἐκεῖ; so A.—M.]
Lange: For where is emulation and quarrelsomeness, there is seditious work and all manner of evil doing.
[. . . emulation and party-strife, there is perturbation and every evil deed.—M.]

Verse 17. [21] A. B. C. Sin. and al. omit καὶ after ἀδιάκριτος.
[22] τῆς before δικαιοσύνης is omitted in A. B. C. L. [and Cod Sin.—M.]
Lange: But the wisdom from above is first of all consecrated [theocratically pure or chaste, free from apostasy], then peaceable, equitably disposed [philanthropical, humane], gladly yielding, full of compassion and good fruits, without separatism, without hypocrisy.
[. . . first pure, then peaceable, equitable, compliant, . . . undistinguishing, without hypocrisy.—M.]

Verse 18. Lange: But the [future] fruit of righteousness is sown in peace by them. . . .

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Analysis: Caution against the Judaistic bias to fanatical activity of teaching, vv. 1. 2.—The power of the tongue vv. 3, 4 (first half). The depravity of the tongue vv. 5, 6.—The untamableness of the tongue, vv. 7, 8.—The duplicity (German "doubletonguedness," *Doppelzüngigkeit*) of the [fanatically excited] tongue, vv. 9–12.—The contrast of false and true wisdom in speech according to their opposite operations, vv. 13–18.

Caution against the Judaistic bias to fanatical activity of teaching.

Vers. 1, 2. The exhortation progresses from Judaistic visionariness (ch. i.) and from Judaistic particularism and exclusiveness (ch. ii.) to Judaistic, fanatical activity of teaching, to the evil, exciting and pernicious tongue-sins of bitter emulation, cursing, envying and party-strife exhibited in a false, devilish wisdom in contrast with true and heavenly wisdom. That this section is an essential point peculiar to the entire Epistle, is evident from the fact that it has been announced already in ch. i. 17, 26. The fanatical, proselyting and polemical mania for teaching, which is here described by James, had previously been delineated by the Lord Himself, Matth. xxiii., and by Paul the Apostle in Rom. ii. 17; it is here and there illuminated in Acts (ch. xv.) and in the Pauline Epistles (2 Cor. xi. 18; Phil. iii. 2; Gal. ii.), and it is finally condemned in Rev. ii. 9. Wiesinger heads this chapter "against the itch of teaching" and adds the observation—that "the author passes on to the ready-tongued teaching and finding fault with others, because this is the false actualization of the πίστις of his readers, whereby they think themselves warranted to dispense with genuine actualization [*i. e.* the practical exhibition of living faith by good works.—M.]. Nothing is nearer to a faith which consists in knowledge only than conceit of teaching and dogmaticalness (cf. Rom. ii. 17 etc.). Thus ch. iii. is the carrying out of the censure James had already passed on his readers in ch. i. 19, 20 and similarly as in ch. i. 26, 27, where the author had indicated inability to bridle the tongue as the

characteristic of a purely imaginary religion and the exhibition of compassionating love as the characteristic of true religion, he now returns to [we ought to say: he now takes up in earnest] this subject, and represents to his readers that the human inability, so strongly developed in them, of taming the tongue, ought to cure them effectually of the desire to teach others." Huther: "Words had taken the place of works."

VER. 1. **Do not become many teachers.**—The exposition of Huther (and of de Wette, Wiesinger) "be not teachers in great numbers," gives hardly a satisfactory sense. For if reference were made to ecclesiastically ordained offices of teaching (as Wiesinger maintains with reference to 2 Tim. iv. 5), the language of the Apostle would hardly convey the rebuke he intends to administer. It is evidently his purpose to censure the false mania for teaching, the dogmatizing contentiousness, which is thoroughly characteristic of the Judaizing Christian. We therefore connect (with Gebser and Schneckenburger) πολλοὶ with γίνεσθαι and so that πολλοὶ and διδάσκαλοι form one idea. Do not end with being a great host of teachers. Luther: "Let not every one dare to be a teacher." The expression has consequently an ironical colouring and even stronger than the μὴ πάντες of Grotius.

Knowing that we.—They know it and they ought to be conscious of it. [Huther remarks that εἰδότες, being closely joined in the Imperative, is itself hortatory: "knowing, that ye might know." James says here "*we* shall receive" and in v. 2 "*we* all offend" and thus forcibly practises his precepts vv. 2, 17, 18. Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 12.—M.].

A greater condemnation.—Although κρίμα cannot signify "responsibility" only (so Hottinger and Augusti) the ordinary N. T. usage does not necessitate us to insist with Wiesinger (who remarks however that a *sententia damnatoria* is out of the question) and Huther on the meaning "*punitory sentence.*" The fact that James includes himself is certainly against the latter construction. "The humility of love" (Wiesinger) surely could not cause him to assert something, which was inapplicable to Himself, and Huther's observation that the punitory sentence might be postponed, does not by any means settle the difficulty. κρίμα denotes primarily *judgment*, then more definitely a *judicial sentence* and it generally becomes a *punitory sentence* by the connection, just as the connection here does not make it so. Moreover, how were the readers of the Epistle to know that all teachers as such have to expect heavy punishment (German, punitory sentences). The increased measure of the sentence may be gathered from various sayings of our Lord (Matth. xxiii. 13 and elsewhere). The increased measure, to be sure, indicates that the severer sentence agreeably to nature may easily turn into a punitive sentence.

VER. 2. **For manifoldly we offend all** (ἅπαντες).—This assertion is absolutely valid. The Apostle includes himself without any qualification, just as Peter (Acts. xv. 11), Paul (Phil. iii. 12) and John (1 Jno. i. 8) include themselves in similar assertions. Although πταίειν does not bear directly on the *errores, qui docentibus obvenire possint* (Grotius), but comprehends moral offences in the widest sense (Huther), the word is so chosen as forthwith to point to moral errors and offences and these occur for the most part in the sphere of teaching (*Lehrrede*=didactic utterance).

If a man offendeth not in word.—The asyndeton indicates that James progresses in the same sphere of thought and hence aims not at an antithesis, as Wiesinger rightly observes. Although the ἐν λόγῳ may not have to be limited to ἐν διδασκαλίᾳ (cf. ch. i. 19), as Pott maintains, the context requires us to think of didactic offences which were the soul of Judaizing proceedings.

He is a perfect man.—Supply ἐστί. Every word is here significant; οὗτος denotes the rarity of such a man, ἀνήρ indicates that the Apostle refers in particular to a sphere of males and their doings, τέλειος describes once more the N. T. maturity of faith, principial completion. The proposition may easily be generalized and made to denote the ideal of the Christian life which none can attain here on earth (see de Wette); but James manifestly refers to something attainable, which is evident from what follows.

Able even to bridle the whole body.—This inference is founded on the thought that the tongue is that member of the body over which man finds it most difficult to establish the mastery and that he who does not offend in word, shows that he has established that mastery. Consequently: he who offendeth in no word and thereby shows himself to be the master of his tongue, has obtained the mastery over his whole body. But just as the inference is here not to the physical tongue as such but only as the organ and symbol of readiness of speech, so James does not "set the body as such in opposition to man" as a relative independent power which offers moral resistance to the will of the "Ego" (Wiesinger, Huther), but the body denotes here the organ and symbol of all human action with the exception of speech. The sense in brief is therefore as follows: he who truly masters his words, will also master his works. Life under the law of liberty is most difficult to be evidenced in the mastery of one's speech. Huther also afterwards acknowledges the figurative in the language of James: "The καρδία indeed is the fountain of evil deeds (Matth. xv. 19), but the lust which is rooted therein, has so thoroughly appropriated the members of man and *as it were* fixed its dwelling in them, that they appear as lusting subjects and may be represented as such in living-concrete language." But the figures of the horse and the ship, which follow, prove that the reference is not only to opposing sinfulness (the seeming law in the members Rom. vii. 23), but also to the naturalness itself which is subordinated to the spirit and needs guiding; for the horse does not resist its rider, and the ship its helmsman, as the old man resists the new. Huther moreover sets here aside several explanations ("the whole connection of the acts and changes of man" Baumgarten, etc.), which are more or less well suited to define the idea on which the "*as it were,*" in connection with the body needing to be guided, is based. But the organic concretion and membering (Gliederung=articulating) of the lusts of

the heart in the sinfully untuned corporealness must be held fast.

The power of the tongue, vv. 3, 4.

James illustrates the power and import of the tongue by two comparisons. In v. 2 he had set it forth as being relatively the most mighty member among the members of the body, he now develops the thought that it is the ruling member, the control of which involves the control of the whole body. He takes for granted that it is only the spirit which can control the body; but the organ of its rule, the instrument to be controlled for the control of the body, is just the tongue. The word is the disposer of acts. "This whole discussion of the wild power of the tongue is not 'bombast' (Schleiermacher), but designed to make clear to his readers their perverseness." Wiesinger. Right, but James knows also a power of the tongue in a good sense.

First figure. VER. 3. **But if we put the bit into the mouths of horses.**—The Apostle introduces first the figure of horses, because he had already before borrowed therefrom the figurative expression χαλιναγωγῆσαι (v. 2; ch. i. 25). Hence the Genitive τῶν ἵππων should probably be joined with τοὺς χαλινοὺς (Theile), and not with τὰ στόματα (Oecumenius and al. Huther). [τῶν ἵππων appears to stand first for the sake of emphasis. Translating literally "But if of horses we put the bits into the mouth" is not English. (Alford). We have therefore expressed the idea in idiomatic English; the distinction of Lange to connect τῶν ἵππων with τοὺς χαλινοὺς instead of joining it with τὰ στόματα is really a distinction without a difference. We put *bits* into the mouths of horses, that is real, material bits; of course, *such* bits we do not put into the mouths of men. The sense is really the same on either construction. The similitude contains the application.—M.]. The bits [Lange throughout uses the word *Zaum*=bridle, but χαλινός is not the *bridle*, but its metal mouth-piece. I have therefore uniformly rendered *Zaum*=bit.—M.] of horses as literal bits are contrasted with the figurative. But both kinds belong to the respective mouths: the horse-bit belongs to a horse's mouth, the man-bit to a man's mouth. Thus the principal accent lies certainly on τὰ στόματα. These constitute the *tertium comparationis*, not "the smallness of the χαλινοί, as the majority of commentators suppose" Huther. The apodosis begins with καὶ ὅλον (Wiesinger, Huther); it is not contained in v. 5 (Theile); nor does it require us to supply something in thought (de Wette). μετάγειν occurs in the N. T. only here and v. 4.—

Second figure.—VER. 4. **Behold even the ships.**—The organ of guiding, probably connected with the natural unruliness of the horse to be guided, was the principal idea of the first figure: the mouth, the tongue; in the second figure it is the contrast between the smallness of the organ, the fine touch required to influence it and the greatness as well as the storm-tossed condition of the ship to be turned. The small rudder on which the will of man with almost the stillness of spirits, exerts its impulse, governs the whole great ship with all the fearful reaction of the wind and the waves, which like infuriated elementary spirits oppose the firm spirit of the steersman. Hence the first καί, as well as ἰδού, denotes intensification. The participial sentence ὄντα brings out the immense weight which the rudder has to overcome; *which are so* great, or *though so* great.—ἐλαύνειν to drive on, set in motion, is used elsewhere in the N. T. of navigating proper [cf. Mark vi. 48; Jno. vi. 19, LXX. for שׁוּט, Is. xxxiii. 21.—M.], but then also of restless agitation 2 Pet. ii. 17. Fierce winds are the wild navigators of the ship whom the human navigator opposes with his rudder. They have doubtless a symbolical import, as Bede did think, not however as the *appetitus mentium* originating within, but as the great temptations (πειρασμοί) of the world, coming from without, the place of whose nativity, to be sure, is within (see ch. i. 6). The little rudder is here obviously the antitype of the little tongue. [Bede's exposition may be found useful in point of *application*, although it is hardly sound in point of *exegesis*. "Naves magnæ in mari, mentes sunt hominum in hac vita, sive bonorum sive malorum. Venti validi, a quibus minantur, ipsi appetitus sunt mentium, quibus naturaliter coguntur aliquid agere etc."—M.].

Whithersoever the direction.—Although ὁρμή hardly denotes the *impulsus externus*, the steerman's pressure on the rudder (Erasmus and many others), the translation "eager will, desire of something" (Bede, Calvin, Huther etc.) is hardly sufficient; ὁρμή always indicates active will developed into an effort or onset; hence here the direction, the course of the navigator, kept in action by the rudder. On similar comparisons among the classics see Gebser, Theile. [ὁρμή signifies primarily *any violent pressure onwards* (ὄρνυμι), then *the first stir* or *move* towards a thing, then impulse, eager desire in the sense of will. I render "will," because the will of the steersman directs the impulse given to the rudder and thereby to the ship.—M.].—"The two similitudes of the bit and navigation have often been connected by the ancients in a similar manner, so that Pricæus even thought that James might have borrowed them from Plato or some other Greek writer." Gebser. Huther further calls attention to the circumstance that the reference here is to the actual εὐθύνων, not to the technical or official εὐθυντήρ.

VER. 5. **Thus also the tongue.**—A little member like the little rudder.

And boasteth great things.—Since μεγαλαυχεῖ describes absolutely haughty and overbearing conduct, the reading μεγάλα αὐχεῖ seems to be preferable (see note in Appar. Crit. above). For James had spoken of a great and praiseworthy doing; he could not with οὕτως pass at once from the figure of the rudder to the pernicious doing of the tongue. The ἰδού moreover separates the thought under notice from the contemplation of the pernicious operation of the tongue, which follows. The selection of the term simply intimates that the tongue not only does great things, but boasts of the great things. Bede: "*Magna exaltat.*" The explanation "accomplishes great things" Luther (similarly Oecumenius, Calvin and al.), gives tone to the fundamental idea without preserving the shading [*i.e.* the gradual shading off—M.]. Persevering

to the idea μεγαλαυχεῖ (Huther, similarly Wiesinger) is not based on the context.

The pernicious doing of the tongue.

v. 3 (second half), v. 6. **Behold how small a fire.**—ἡλίκον gives prominence to the quantity according to the construction, either in point of greatness or smallness; here in point of smallness (Cajetanus, Huther). de Wette understands it as denoting a great fire; but the Apostle's design was not so much the aesthetic contemplation of a forest-conflagration, as to point to the wicked origin thereof in a little spark; against this Wiesinger justly lays stress on ἀνάπτει [which is not=consumed, but=lighteth up, kindleth. Seneca (*Cont.* v, 5) employs very similar language "*quam lenibus initiis quanta incendia oriantur.*"—M.].—Huther, adverting to corresponding descriptions in Homer, Pindar, Philo etc., points out that the concrete sense of ὕλη=forest, is preferable to the vaguer *materia* =combustible etc. [The classical descriptions are found in Homer, *Il.* xi. 115: Plutarch, *Sympos.* viii. p. 730; Pindar, *Pyth.* iii. 66; Virgil, *Georg.* ii. 303.—M.].

Ver. 6. **The tongue also is a fire.**—The figure of a spark or a very small fire producing the conflagration of a forest, is now applied to the incendiary ravages of the tongue. The tongue is fiery as to its nature in general, *i. e.* the organ of speech, easily inflamed by spiritual fire, by passionate, vehement and consuming impulse. James here passes over the fact that the tongue is destined to become an organ of heavenly fire, Acts ii., for his eye is fixed on the pernicious fire of fanaticism which begins to inflame the Judaistic spirits throughout the world.

It, the world of unrighteousness [that world of iniquity].—Not an elliptical clause, requiring ὕλη to complete it in the sense "the tongue is the fire, the world is the forest."—Morus and al. This cosmos then is a further designation of the tongue. According to Wiesinger κόσμος in general, denotes the sum-total of what is created (Matth. xiii. 35; Eph. i. 4), "the cosmos of unrighteousness," hence here "the sum-total of unrighteousness." So Huther citing ὅλος ὁ κόσμος τῶν χρημάτων LXX. Prov. xvii. 8. Calvin: "*Acsi vocaret mare et abyssum.*" Olshausen and al., "it is as it were the unrighteous world itself, which has its seat in the tongue." See the interpretations of Theile, Estius, Herder, Gebser, Clericus (who with others holds the words to be spurious), in Huther. Oecumenius and many others read κόσμος=adornment of unrighteousness: the tongue adorns unrighteousness by rhetorical arts. Wiesinger objects 1. that κόσμος is a passive idea, 2. that the sense would be too feeble. The word need not be taken in the sense of "adornment," but we may nevertheless suppose that James here, as frequently, returns to the original signification of the Greek word. In point of fact it is the tongue which sophistically, rhetorically, poetically, parenthetically and imperatively gives to unrighteousness its worldly, apparently respectable and even splendid form. We therefore suppose that James wanted to say that "the tongue is the form of the world, worldliness, worldly culture, the seemingly beautiful world of unrighteousness." At all events he could have described it as the sum-total of unrighteousness only in a highly figurative sense. We therefore hold with Tischendorf and Neander against Huther and the majority of commentators, that ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας does not belong appositionally to what goes before, but belongs to what follows. The addition "the sum-total of unrighteousness" would not explain the proposition "the tongue is a fire." But it is to be understood that the tongue is prominent among the members as the world of unrighteousness. It is however matter of inquiry what is the meaning of καθίσταται? The following interpretations are idle, to say nothing of their incorrectness: it *stands*, it *is placed*, it *is set;* that of Huther also is inadequate: it *sets itself, appears* in connection with what follows, as that which polluteth the whole body. In agreement with the full meaning of καθιστάναι and with the context, the word according to the analogy of Heb. viii. 3 and other passages, taken absolutely, denotes the presidency, the domination of the tongue among the members. In virtue of its worldly culture, which understands even how to beautify unrighteousness, the tongue rules among the members. But what a contrast between its works and its position! And it is just *it*, which from its prominence *pollutes the whole body.*—Before the world it washes all unrighteousness clean, before God or truth it stains and pollutes the whole body, *i. e.* the tongue, by the preceding, sinful word paves the way to all the sinful acts of all the members. Although σπιλοῦν does not suit πῦρ (notwithstanding Bengel's explanation "*ut ignis per fumum*"), it suits the saying "the tongue is the κόσμος" as its perfect antithesis. Apparent comeliness is the most essential deformity of life. How it pollutes the life is apparent from what follows. [But there seems really to be no objection to the rendering "*makes itself,*" which is preferable to Lange's, because it is founded on better grammar than his and gives a good, clear and unforced sense. καθίσταται is used here as in ch. iv. 4. Huther. "The tongue by acting in and upon the members, makes itself to be the defiler of the whole body. It is so made ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, which, as their name intimates, ought to move in harmonious *melody* and amicable concert with each other; and so glorify their maker. But the tongue mars their music by its discord. It is even like an intestine volcano; and sends forth a dark stream of lava, and a murky shower of ashes and smoke, and is thus a source of pollution, *sullying* and *staining* as with foul blots (σπιλοῦσα) the beauty of all around it; and *also* like a volcano, it emits a flood of fire." Wordsworth.—M.].

And inflameth.—Wiesinger takes καί, καί in the sense "as well as," and sets both in the relation of logical subordination to ἡ σπιλοῦσα. We object with Huther, because the following words are not only explanatory but intensive. The tongue inflames

The wheel of the development of life.—That τροχός denotes a *wheel* requires no further proof (see 1 Kings vii. 30 etc.; Ezek. i. 15, 19, 20). But the question is what is the meaning of γένεσις and what is therefore the meaning of τροχὸς γενέσεως? According to Huther γένεσις

denotes here "as in ch. i. 28" (see the passage), *birth*, the wheel of birth; that is: the wheel revolving from our birth, *i. e.* life. Similarly Oecumenius. Taking the separate features differently, Calvin and al. reach the same idea: the wheel is the *cursus*, the genesis is the *natura;* the two united—life.—Wiesinger (after Kern) passes from the interpretation "it inflameth the revolving wheel," the spherical course of being (Pott, Schneckenburger), to another: "it inflameth the circumference of our corporeal being" (literally "of that which has become"). As the axis or centre of the circle it diffuses its fire over the whole circumference. However, genesis, taken in the sense of birth, is not life itself but itself only the first revolution of the wheel. Although we need not think (with de Wette following more ancient commentators) of the orb of creation absolutely, or of the cycle of the self-renovation of mankind (תּוֹלְדוֹת גַּלְגַּל, Wolf and al.); it does not follow that genesis here should be taken as birth only, and life only as individual life. The genesis of man rather progresses in an ethical sense through the whole of his earthly existence, and if it is said that the tongue setteth on fire the wheel or the revolution of the development of life, the word in this generality applies not only to individual life, but also to the life of humanity, primarily of course, to the life of the Jewish people, but in its widest sense even to the development of the life of this (earthly) cosmos. The fanatical fire, which at first made the development of the life of individual Jews a continuously growing fire of a burning and revolving wheel, at last seized the development of the life of the whole Jewish nation (for chiliastic worldliness lay at the bottom of the crucifixion of Christ and of the Jewish War) and imperceptibly communicates itself to all mankind and to the earthly κόσμος as the causality of the fiery day, the last day—immanent in the world. James is fully right in saying that it is the tongue which changes the wheel of the human development of life into a burning fire-wheel; or we might say: a ship on fire entering the port. Perhaps every man may find in his course of life a proportionate quantity of this feverish fire-impulse (see Ps. xc.) "This verb φλογίζειν is ἅπαξ λεγ, in N. T.; it occurs in the LXX. Ex. ix. 24. Huther, with whom we should interpret the word of the fire of passion and not with Morus "*de damnis quæ linguas dat*," although the self-consumption of this sin of burning passion is also alluded to, and the reference is not to a mere kindling (Michælis). [Alford renders "the orb of creation," and Wordsworth "the wheel of nature." The idea in both is really the same. The note of the latter will doubtless be prized; "The τροχὸς γενέσεως is the wheel of nature, the *orbis terrarum*, the world itself in its various revolutions; in which one generation follows another, and one season succeeds another; and so τροχὸς γενέσεως is used by Simplicius in Epict. p. 94, and other like expressions in authors quoted here by Wetstein, p. 670.—In a secondary sense, this τροχὸς γενέσεως is the *wheel of human nature*, of *human life*, of *human society*, which is compared to a *wheel* by Solomon Eccl. xii. 6; and so Greg. Naz. (*in Sentent. ap.* a Lapide), and Silius Ital. 8, 6, "rota *volvitur ævi*," and Bœthius (*de Consol.* 2, pr. 1), "*hæc nostra vita est* rotam *volubili orbe versamus*." This wheel is ever rolling round, ever turning apace, whirling about, never continuing in one stay, seeking rest and finding none. So these words of the Apostle are explained by Oecumen., Bede, and Bp. Andrewes, 1, 361; 2, 294, 319.—The functions of a wheel, set on fire by the internal friction of its own axis, are deranged, and so the organization of human society is disturbed and destroyed by the intestine fire of the human tongue; a fire which diffuses itself from the centre and radiates forth to the circumference by all the spokes of slander and detraction, and involves the social framework in combustion and conflagration.—M.].

And itself is inflamed.—Not only once, but habitually (φλογιζομένη Part. Pres.). It is as unwarrantable to change the participle into the preterite as to explain it of the future, as a prophecy of hell-fire (Grotius and al.).

By hell. Gehenna itself uniformly and throughout to be distinguished from Sheol (besides the synoptical gospel found here only), as a symbolically described fire-region (γέεννα τοῦ πυρός) will not be wholly completed before the end of the world. The positive primitive fire of Gehenna is brought about by the immanent heat of devilish passions which proceed from the devil through his kingdom. This devilish heat, therefore, is here described as the causality of that fanatical heat of men (cf. v. 15). That fiery heat of fanaticism the origin of which the Judaists wanted to refer to God (ch. i. 13). James refers directly to the devil. And in this manner it exhibited itself by hatred, lying and death and particularly by frenzy. The strongest utterance concerning the evil tongue excepting the sayings of our Lord of the blasphemy of the Holy Ghost and the apocalyptic saying of the blasphemies of the beast (Dan. vii. viii.; Rev. xiii.)! Approximating descriptions are produced by Huther, Ps. lii. 4; cxx. 3, 4; Prov. xvi. 26; Sir. v. 15. Wiesinger in addition to the specification of sin according to the members of the body, as here indicated, cites also Rom. iii. 13; Col. iii. 5. But the latter passage belongs to another chapter; the seeming members (Scheinglieder) of the old man.—But Rom. vi. 13, 19 belongs hither.

The untamableness of the tongue. vv. 7, 8.

VER. 7. **For every nature of the wild beasts.**—γὰρ creates difficulty. Huther thinks that it substantiates, especially with reference to v. 8, the foregoing judgment expressed concerning the tongue. But the assertion concerning the untamableness of the tongue does not substantiate the assertion concerning the depravity of the tongue. Wiesinger makes γὰρ substantiate even the preceding μεγαλαυχεῖ, while Pott holds that it simply indicates the transition. In our opinion the γὰρ substantiates the words immediately preceding: "itself is imflamed by hell." Whereby will he prove that assertion? By the untamableness of the tongue. If the nature of the tongue were only animal, man, the power of human nature could tame it as well as every thing animal. But the untamableness of the tongue shows that there is something devilish in its excitement, over which human nature left to itself has no power. Only by the wisdom which is from

above v. 15, can be conquered the wisdom which is from beneath, *i. e.* devilish wisdom, v. 15, and that not in the form of taming, breaking in and enslaving, but in the form of free transformation by regeneration. James first specifies what can be tamed,—universal animal nature, then what can tame it—human nature. Man as man is a match for a beast, but if the animal element in man is strengthened by the devils, he can acquire the superiority of the ἀνὴρ τέλειος only by Divine grace. James divides the animal world into four classes. He first mentions together quadrupeds (not beasts in general, Pott, or wild beasts in particular, Erasmus etc.) and birds, that is the higher and more noble species of beasts. Then the dismal creeping beasts (not "animalia terrestria" in general [Pott], not only serpents in particular [Luther, Calvin], but amphibia and worms as in Gen. xxiv. 25), and the stupid sea-animals (not only fishes in the literal sense [Huther], nor sea-wonders [Luther], nor sea-monsters [Stier]). Huther: "The classification is here the same as in Gen. ix. 2, which passage may have been before the Apostle's mind." James doubtless thought of serpents as the representatives of creeping beasts, with reference to the conjurers of serpents, of trained fishes, dolphins or the like as the representatives of sea-animals. We see here, moreover, that even menageries or the art of taming beasts have some reference to apostolical truth. The opinion of the Apostle really amounts to this: all φύσις, every φύσις, as further specified is subjected to human φύσις; the condition only, that man understand the natures, which are subjected to him and seize them at the right spot of want, docility or dependence. Huther rightly observes that James does not describe the relation of man the individual to individual beasts, but the relation of human nature to animal nature in general.

By human nature—So we must take the Dative [it is the Dative of the *agent*—M.], not as a *dativus commodi*. Human nature is here the whole power of mankind, as it is made to depend on itself in dependence upon God, Gen. i.; hence not only the "ingenii solertia" (Hottinger), but that ingenuity regarded as the most proper characteristic of human δύναμις in its superiority to animal power.

Is tamed and hath been tamed.—For this is a process which beginning with the most remote past continues to the most distant future. The beasts are more and more subjected to human nature, while the diabolically excited tongue (to which in the modern world must also be reckoned the pen, so that Satan now speaks more to men by the goose-quill [or the steel-pen—M.] than by the mouth of the serpent) becomes increasingly untamable (see Rev. xiii. 6). δάμαζεσθαι δύναται is by this process illustrated as a fact, and consequently assumed in the two tenses of the verb, and not limited to the present only (Schneckenburger and al.); δαμάζειν moreover denotes not the conquest of our resistance (Huther) which also takes place in conversion, but the translation into a coerced-psychico-physical dependence by the use of appropriate means. If it is said therefore that the tongue cannot be tamed by human nature, this implies also that it cannot be tamed in the form of taming. This expression may also affirm with reference to the animal world that man's original relation to the beasts has not altogether remained the same (see Gen. ix. 2; cf. Gen. i. 28; ii. 20). Wiesinger: "In the opinion of James also man's dominion over the creatures is not lost (cf. Ps. viii. 7, 9) but it has been modified like his relation to the earth itself." v. 9 also furnishes a parallel to this verse.

VER. 8. **But the tongue no one of men.**—Estius and al.: the tongue of *others*; Huther, one's *own* tongue. Doubtless *primarily one's own* tongue, for the taming of the tongue must proceed from the heart; but the more general sense must not be lost sight of. Before the human tongue diabolically grown wild natural humanity stands as before a dragon, for whom there is not found a Knight St. George among men as they are. Bengel, who interprets: "*nemo alius, vix ipse quisque*," overlooks that the antithesis between the natural power of man and a higher power is here postulated. But that which still causes James to utter an expression of indignation, is the pernicious working of the tongue in the Judaistic world of his time.

The turbulent evil.—We interpret κακόν in the positive ethical sense as wickedness or evil and the adjective ἀκατάστατον (see App. Crit.) with reference to ch. i. 8 and ἀκαταστασία ch. iii. 16 according to the meaning of the word in Luke xxi. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 33; 2 Cor. vi. 5; xii. 20. The revolutionary conduct of the Judaistic tongues became at that time more and more inflamed in order to prepare for the Jewish people nothing but evil, death and ruin. [Alford thinks that the figure here seems to correspond nearly to what is related of Proteus, that he eluded the grasp of Menelaus under many various shapes. Cf. Hermas, *Pastor* 2, 8, πονηρὸν πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ καταλαλία, καὶ ἀκατάστατον δαιμόνιον.—M.].

Full of death-bringing poison.—The diabolical nature, the death-bringing serpent-virulence of the strife of tongues; contains substantially the same idea, as the opinion expressed in the preceding verse; "inflamed by hell," Ps. lviii. 5; cxl. 4.

The duplicity of the (fanatically excited) tongue, vv. 9–12. The new element which is introduced (but not noticed by Huther and Wiesinger) in v. 9, is the falseness, the duplicity, the self-contradiction and consequently the self-judgment (*i. e.* self-condemnation) of the tongue. The serpent-like nature of the tongue, v. 8, forms an apt transition to the duplicity of the same, inasmuch as it is simultaneously deceitful and venemous.

VER. 9. **Therewith bless we the Lord.**—(See Appar. Crit.) ἐν is instrumental. *Blessing* and *cursing* constitute a familiar antithesis; the blessing, εὐλογεῖν, בָּרַךְ, as applied to God, denotes however *praising Him*. The unusual connection "*the Lord and Father*" appears to have been stated not without design. Although *the Lord* here does not directly designate Christ, yet it describes God as the God of revelation, who has finally revealed Himself in Christ as Father. In Him even the Jew praises unconsciously and reluctantly the revelation of God in Christ. (Rom. ix. 5).

And therewith curse we men which.—A difficulty, insufficiently noticed by many commentators, arises from the circumstance that the Apostle includes himself in *we*. In order to escape it, Benson, Gebser and al. suppose that the reference is solely to those who set themselves up as teachers. To be sure the reference is primarily to them, but then also in general to the Judaistic element as a whole. Is the proposition a general confession of sins concerning the abuse of the tongue? or a hypothetical judgment; if we curse men, we do so with the same tongue wherewith we praise God? The design of a particular reproof forbids the former, and the premising of the fact the latter. The difficulty may be solved either by taking the second clause as a question expressive of surprise or by hearing James speak as the representative of his people in the name of his guilty people. [Alford recommends the retention of *which* instead of *who*, which would personally designate *certain men* thus made, while *which* is generic. This distinction, he continues, which some modern philologists are striving to obliterate, is very important in the rendering of Scripture, and has been accurately observed by our English translators.—M.]. The latter is probably the most natural solution.

Have been created after the likeness of God.—That is, the subjects of this Lord, the children of this Father according to their destination, or also the images representing this Lord and Father. This is the glaring contradiction. Wiesinger and Huther (the latter with reference to Bengel's "*remanet nobilitas indelebilis*") here observe that sinful man also remains created in the likeness of God (Gen. i. 26). Without detracting from the general application of the proposition the Apostle may be thinking of such men, in whom the likeness of God (ὁμοίωσις) *i. e.* the actuality and visibility of the image, has *reappeared* [Germ. "has become again," *wieder geworden*—M.], *i. e.* Christians, and particularly according to their majority, Gentile Christians. With regard to them, the contradiction of the cursing Judaists, was perfect; they praised the Father of revelation, they cursed the children of revelation.

VER. 10. **Out of the same mouth goeth forth.**—It is the sinful mouth as to its fanactical excitement in general, but the mouth of Judaism in particular as at that time it continued traditionally to praise God in the Old Testament and began with talmudical rancor (the source of the later Talmud) to curse the Gospel and its adherents.

It shall not be thus. [οὐ χρή, ἀδελφοί μου, ταῦτα οὕτως γίνεσθαι. These things, my brethren, ought not so to be."—M.]. This address to the brethren hardly means only: it is not right that these things (denoting the substance) are done thus (denoting the form). χρή has its full weight and denotes at once that the thing must not be done according to the oracle [here of course with reference to the revealed will of God—M.] and that the thing itself is unprofitable (with reference to χράομαι). Moreover the Plural ταῦτα and the emphatic οὕτως are to be noticed. [χρή is ἅπαξ λεγ. in N. T.—M.].

VER. 11. **Doth a fountain perchance out of the same chink send forth the sweet and the bitter?**—βρύειν, ἅπαξ λεγ., to bubble over, overflow [Lange renders "bubble" with an evident attempt to find a word as nearly intransitive as possible. βρύειν is generally *intransitive*, but it is used transitively by Anacreon, 87, 2 ἴδε πῶς, ἔαρος φανέντος, χάριτες ῥόδα βρύουσιν. It means therefore "to cause to burst forth," and this is the reason why I render "send forth."—M.], ὀπή, the opening of the fountain [ὀπή is probably connected with ὄψ, ὄπτομαι, to see; Wordsworth adds that so the word *Ænon* (the place of *springs*) is derived from the Hebrew עַיִן (*ayin*), an eye, Jno. iii. 23.—M.]; the *sweet* and the *bitter* describe the heterogeneous waters applied to blessing and cursing. Such an occurrence is unknown in nature, hence in the moral world also it only appears as something monstrously unnatural. The fountain is not exactly man, but the disposition, the heart. Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth (the chink of the fountain) speaketh (*Germ:* Whereof the heart is full, the mouth overfloweth.—M.]. However here again the reference is not to the moral unnaturalness of this duplicity in general but the concrete bearing of the reproof on Judaism becomes increasingly apparent. It is not the Divine purpose and law that the fountain of Judaism in its historical *going forth* for the world should send forth such a contradiction between praising God and cursing the children of God. The application to the end of the Christian Middle Ages lies near.

VER. 12. **Can a fig-tree, my brethren, yield olives?**—The figurative statement of the preceding verse is continued in the figures taken from nature, *i. e.* the idea that nature does not bring forth that which is contradictory and inconsistent. But if the former figure was meant to say: "your duplicity [double-tonguedness] is like a fountain which sends forth at the same time sweet water and bitter, if it were possible to find such a fountain," the figures which now follow set forth with still greater distinctness the impossibility of such a contradiction in nature. And this certainly brings out not only the reprehensible and morally unnatural character of duplicity, but it also expresses the idea that one of the two must be false, either the cursing or the blessing; so that if their cursing the images of God be true, their praising God must be lying and hypocrisy (Huther). To this must be added that in the metaphors which follow the reference is to the character itself, as is the case in the saying of our Lord Matth. vii. 16.—Thus we infer their double-mindedness of character which is false on the side of godliness (δίψυχος) from their duplicity of speech. It may however seem strange that James should use several examples in order to corroborate the thought that as nature is always at unity with itself, true and consistent, so also ought man to be true and consistent. The multiplying of examples has primarily the effect of illustrating more forcibly the general application of the law of life, which the Apostle had laid down. But the supposition might occur that the examples may have also a symbolical import. The fig-tree, the symbol of a luxurious natural life cannot bring forth olives, the symbols of spiritual life. The vine, the symbol of theocracy and ultimately of Christianity, cannot pro-

duces figs, happiness [*i. e.* outward], the fulness of the Jewish natural life. The meaning whereof would be as follows: if you want to be natural Jews you cannot bring forth the fruits of the children of the Spirit; but if on the other hand, you want to be Christians, you must not cherish Jewish ideals, sit under the fig-tree of outward prosperity and expect to enjoy its fruit. This would explain the last figure after this manner: as the salt-spring or the salt-current is a mixture which cannot yield pure and drinkable refreshment of life, so a mixture of Jewish severity and hardness and Christian vitality cannot produce the pure water of life of the New Covenant. We leave this symbolism undecided as a whole, but maintain at all events that the salt water is designed to denote a mixture, in which the two elements pure by themselves, have been stained and corrupted. Salt water cannot be drunk. This would give a train of thought which beginning with duplicity in speech passed on to double-mindedness and thence again to its final cause, doubleness of belief, the mixture of legalism and evangelical vitality. On similar biblical figurative modes of speech among the ancients, see Gebser, p. 290; Theile, p. 196.

The contrast of false and true wisdom in speech as to their origin, character and opposite operations. vv. 13–18.

VER. 13. **Who is wise and intelligent among you?**—The same words occur in LXX. Deut. i. 13; iv. 6. Heb. חָכָם וְנָבוֹן. Wisdom is the knowledge of ends acquired by enlightenment; intelligence (or understanding, German, *Einsicht*—M.), the knowledge of relations acquired by experience and practice [Wisdom is the gift of God, intelligence and knowledge are the results of education.—M.]. The Apostle's question sounds like an exclamation of the greatest anxiety; it characterizes the desperately bad spiritual situation of Israel. Their few wise and experienced men are to rise and conjure the storm by the wisdom of gentleness.

Let him show out of a good conversation.—James is here more explicit and definite in describing the works to which he had referred as evidences of faith in ch. ii. Such as flow from a good or beautiful life, in which it develops itself. And in order to remove all doubt concerning the main object he has at heart, he adds emphatically: **in meekness of wisdom.** We refer this clause to the whole proposition which precedes it: all the works of this good conversation are to culminate in meekness of wisdom.—The deviating construction of Neander: let him show it by his good conduct; "his works in meekness of wisdom" is recommended by a certain vivacity and pregnancy, but requires the verb to be mentally repeated; the *αὐτοῦ* also would be rather in the way while the demand of the exhibition of works, so common to James, would be rather obscured. *αὐτοῦ* is based on *τίς*, who wants to advance true claims to being wise. Every weakening of the expression *ἐν πραΰτητι σοφίας* either by reading "meek wisdom" (Bede and al.), or "wise meekness" (Laurentius), affects the full sense of the words: the meekness wherein wisdom evidences itself (Wiesinger somewhat different: which is proper to wisdom and proceeds therefrom), see ch. i. 19, 20. [Alford: "in that meekness which is the proper attribute of wisdom"—M.]. Wiesinger thinks that it describes the disposition attending the doing; but James obviously calls for the activity of meekness, for meekness itself in corresponding acts. It alone was able to deliver the Jewish Christians as well as the Jews from fanaticism, conjure the storm and save the hope of Israel. See the promise Matth. v. 5.

VER. 14. **But if ye have bitter zeal [emulation].**—This was the real situation of affairs and on this account James addresses them personally on the subject. We render *ζῆλος* not jealousy but zeal, for doubtless the reference is primarily to a religious and not to a moral passion. James means the specifically Jewish emulation which was considered by those who exhibited it as enthusiasm for the glory of God, as Paul describes it Rom. x. The adjective shows that it was a false, unholy zeal; *πικρόν* indicates passionateness and animosity; this certainly turns zeal into jealousy, for religious zeal becomes zealotical and fanatical through the admixture of jealousy and hostility. *Ἐριθεία* is really the envy, rivalry and party-strife rooted in venality; so Paul frequently uses the word (Rom. ii. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 20 etc.). *ἔχετε* denotes not only an active having but a real fostering.

In your hearts.—"In contrast with the *word* of the readers who make boast of their wisdom." Huther.

Boast not.—The offence of their excited teaching, striving, judging and cursing was twofold: firstly a haughty self-elevation or proud demeanour against others, secondly a more or less conscious lying suppression of their better consciousness. But both sins were more aggravated from being directed against the truth itself. According to Wiesinger *ἀλήθεια* denotes Christian truth (because otherwise *ψεύδεσθε* would be tautological: to lie against the truth). Huther seems to understand by it only the real fact that the condition of the heart is in opposition to the word. But with James theocratical truth and Christian truth converge into *one truth of the revelation of God*, the effect and import of which are in the lives and consciences of men. The boasting and lying therefore was directed not against a mere object and against a mere fact; but it was a haughty and hypocritical insurrection against the very truth which the zealots, with an evil conscience, professed to protect (see Rom. ii. 23). It becomes more and more evident that James addresses not only the Jewish Christians, but his nation in general.

VER. 15. **[For] this wisdom is not that.**—"*Negatio cum vi præmissa*" Theile. *αὕτη* must be taken in connection with *ἡ σοφία*, the latter is therefore introduced ironically here as in Matth. xi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 6; false wisdom the opposite of the true. Luther's translation: "This is not the wisdom which cometh down from above" must be corrected accordingly. The participle *κατερχομένη* emphatically denotes the continual coming down, as in ch. i. 17; it has therefore adjective force and must not be resolved into the Indicative as do Schneckenburger and al. The expression is a little difficult, but it ceases to be so if we consider that it is the purpose of James

to give the most emphatic negation to the false pretence that it was ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη. Hence he gives his judgment: it is on the contrary (described false by the use of three adjectives) *earthly, sensuous, devilish.* It is earthly as to its earthly nature and origin and thus opposed to the heavenly (Phil. iii. 19); it is sensuous or properly speaking psychical (Luther has the improper rendering "human;" the Vulgate better "*animalis;*" Allioli following it "animal;" Stier and de Wette: "sensuous," which in consideration of the modern idea of "sensuousness" may pass [for want of a better term—M.], having its origin in a psychically restrained passionate constitution deprived of the rule of the Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 14: iii. 8; Jude 19) and is opposed to the spiritual [pneumatical] wisdom—of the spiritual life excited by the Holy Ghost; it is devilish (δαιμονιώδης is ἄπαξ λεγ.), proceeding from the devil or inspired by accursed devils and is opposed to the Divine. Hornejus has not wrongly delineated the moral sides of these evil characteristics: "*terrena, quia avaritiæ dedita est, quæ operibus terrenius inhiat; animalis, quia ad animi lubidines accomodatur; dæmoniaca, quod ambitioni et superbiæ servit, quæ propria diaboli vitia sunt.*" These were surely also the characteristics of Judaistic and Ebionite zealotism. The earthly was peculiarly exhibited in their chiliastic claims to the rule of the earth, the psychical in their fanatical and hateful passions, the devilish in their great errors nourished by haughtiness and hypocrisy.

VER. 16. **For where is emulation [zeal] and party-strife.**—γάρ makes this assertion the proof of the one preceding it. In what goes before James describes a wisdom properly animated by evil zeal and party-strife, and designates it as earthly, sensuous and develish. The proof is that that spirit of emulation and party-strife is so disastrous in its consequences. He does not say "*where is such wisdom,*" for he has torn the mask of wisdom from this evil spirit of emulation. In its nakedness it is carnal and devilish conduct. ζῆλος occurring here without the adjective πικρός might lead one to think at once of jealousy, but the zeal is sufficiently characterized as evil from being connected with rivalry and party-strife. Everywhere is exhibited the rebellious element. ἀκαταστασία is not only mere disorder but the dissolution of order; in the theocratic sense it denotes rebellion (Numb. xvi.; Prov. xxvi. 28), in church-life a seditious spirit opposing the order of God, who has constituted civil order (Rom. xiii. 1, etc.) and church order (1 Cor. xiv. 33).

And all manner of [every] evil work.—φαῦλον might be rendered "*foul*" (German "*faul*") in an ethical sense. [Shakspeare uses the word in the sense of wicked, abominable. "A *foul* fault:" "*Foul* profanation." The current value of '*faul*' in German is *rotten, lazy*, its ethical value denotes moral rottenness, evil.—M.]. Such was the situation of Jewish affairs at that time. The rebellious attitude broke out everywhere in insurrections against the Christians, which were the prelude of the insurrection against the Romans, with numerous episodes of evil work, and all proceeding from the same fountain of diabolical fanaticism.

VER. 17. **But the wisdom from above.**—See Proverbs; the Wisdom of Solomon; Sirach; Matth. xi.; 1 Cor. viii. Its first characteristic is distinguished from the others, as its principle.

Consecrated [pure].—ἁγνή. Really *consecrated* [or *hallowed*—M.], *i. e.* not only *pure* from the influence or even from the inspiration of worldly, carnal and devilish motives, but only **chaste**, free from the spirit of apostasy into which the fanatical zealots fell, but also animated by the Divine Spirit and therefore wholly consecrated to the service and glory of God; consequently full of a dignified and priestly character. From this principle flow its social virtues. It is **peaceable**, *ironical* (Matth. v. 9), **equitably disposed** (1 Tim. iii. 3), **gladly yielding** ([*compliant*—M.]. Εὐπειθής the opposite of stubborn, ἀπειθής Tit. iii. 5; not "easily persuaded," but well inclined to enter into the views and reasons of others, compliant). All this as opposed to the contentiousness of false zeal. But it not only resists evil, but overcomes evil with good; it **is full of compassion** (in the widest sense, in its sympathy with the necessitous ch. i. 27; ii. 13) **and good fruits**, in which compassion is evidenced. The contrast is exhibited in the seditious character and the foul doings of false wisdom. So stood in those days Christianity over against its enemies and so it was to show itself also in the Jewish Christians over against Judaism. This attitude of wisdom induced James still further to add in its praise ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος! de Wette, Wiesinger and Huther render the first word '*without doubting;*' that is, consequently, *confident, decided.* This would give a good sense if 1. the reference here were not to social conduct and 2. if a certain correspondency between ἀδιάκριτος and ἀνυπόκριτος were not necessary.—Now since the word (as well as that which follows) has to be taken in an active sense, although its primary meaning is passive (not distinguished, undecided, so that the first word might mean "*undivided,*" "being a unit" [*einheitlich*], there being only *one* wisdom—"*non duplex*" Wetstein; "simple" Neander—and the second *undivided, i. e.*, without any false admixture) the idea "not *separatistic*, not *sectarian*" seems to lie nearest (so Baumgarten, Schneckenburger and al.: "*quæ non discernit homines;*" Luther, Grotius, etc.: "without partiality;" Vulgate: "*non judicans;*" Semler: "*non temere judicans*"): With this corresponds then ἀνυπόκριτος, without hypocrisy, without dissembling, sincere Rom. xii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 6. [The reader is referred for further information on ἀδιάκριτος to notes on ch. i. 6–8; ii. 4; on ἀνυπόκριτος to ch. i. 22, 26; ii. 1].

VER. 18. **Fruit of righteousness.**—This difficult expression might be taken literally as follows: the fruit which consists in the life-righteousness as just described (*Genit. appos.* not only justification, Schneckenburger), is once more turned into seed, it is sown in the world, primarily among erring brethren, in peace, *i. e.*, in the form of peace, in the exhibitions of a peaceful demeanour [not εἰς εἰρήνην, *i. e.*, unto eternal life, de Wette), and then becomes the lot of the children of peace as the harvest of peace and the kingdom of peace. But Wiesinger rightly calls attention to ch. i. 20. "For the wrath of man worketh not, accomplishes not the righteousness of God," and adds "that

which the readers pretend to realize by their contentious wisdom, can only prosper under the quickening influence of peace." The righteousness of God in its full manifestation in the world, for which Christians are yearning and for which at that time the Jews in particular were yearning also, is a harvest-fruit which has to be sown by the peaceful demeanour of the peacemakers (*τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην Dat. actionis.* Huther). The term *καρπός*, etc., would be therefore "a pregnant expression for: the seed, which yields the fruit of righteousness, is sown." (Huther). This construction is also favoured by the remark of Huther, made elsewhere, that James is fond of beginning his speech with the teleological leading idea. Huther rightly observes that the sowing is not only teaching proper (Schneckenburger), still, it remains a fundamental form of evangelical peace-making. The *dat. comm.* in *τοῖς ποιοῦσιν* "for the children of peace," is reluctantly given up and Wiesinger would like to connect this meaning with the *Dat. actionis.* It must be observed, however, that the world-historical harvest of righteousness will affect all men, although it will be a kingdom of peace only to the children of peace. The words of the Apostle therefore were primarily an exhortation addressed to his readers, *i. e.*, to the twelve tribes to this effect: if you really seek the righteousness of God, then prepare the future harvest of righteousness in such wise that as children of peace you scatter the seed by a peaceful behaviour (which includes, to be sure, the peace of the Christian righteousness of faith). Sow peace and you will reap rightousness to your joy. But the idea must be so construed that the Apostle is made at the same time to lay stress on the fact that the harvest of righteousness is prepared under all circumstances. Whether you join in or not: that righteousness, for which you suppose to contend in zealotical party-strife, is now sown with the patience of the sower (see ch. v. 7) by the peacemakers who are really in the world, by Christians in their exhibitions of peaceful demeanour (*ἐν εἰρήνῃ* hardly denotes mere mode, but rather the form of the seed, evangelical peace), and at the time of harvest it will appear in its full maturity.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The fault which James reproves in the greater part of this chapter, is nothing but a natural manifestation of the egotism of sinful human nature, a fault which, although suppressed, is by no means fully overcome even in Christians. It would seem that, as elsewhere, there were many among the first readers of this Epistle in particular, of whom the author knew or at least was afraid that they were more fond of speaking than of hearing, more fond of teaching others than of receiving instruction themselves. He therefore seizes the fault, described in ch. i. 19, 26 by the root, at the same time pointing out, that those who set themselves up as teachers, are in the greatest danger of bringing on themselves greater condemnation than their hearers. His doctrine in this respect is in perfect agreement with that of our Lord, Matt. xii. 36, 37.

2. There are not a few in our day who set up as teachers and leaders of the congregation without being sufficiently prepared for this important and difficult work, who thus render more difficult the work of the duly appointed servants of the Gospel and scatter the flock without cause; and there are others who suffer themselves to be duly led and to be prepared for the holy ministry, but whose desire to enter the ministry springs from very impure motives. How desirable that both would seriously lay to heart the teaching of James on this subject! [Ministerial preparation is not sufficiently appreciated by the uneducated portions of the laity and not unfrequently made light of by the ecclesiastical authorities. In a new country, like America, the supply of ministers is not equal to the demand and owing to this circumstance men morally and spiritually fitted but intellectually and educationally unfitted, are frequently put in charge of churches, whose best interests are apt to be grievously affected in such incompetent hands. The moral and spiritual qualifications of candidates for the holy ministry is a *conditio sine qua non*, but their possession cannot cover or supply intellectual and educational deficiency. How can a man preach the Gospel intelligently and beneficially, if he is ignorant of the first principles of correct interpretation, completely at sea in scientific theology and void of all knowledge of Church History and other cognate branches of a theological education? If these lines are read by any minister, who is conscious of his intellectual deficiency, the writer would affectionately entreat him to remember that he ought to be *thoroughly* equipped for the study of God's Holy Word and that he cannot *teach* his people aright, if he does not understand aright. The *cacoethes docendi* is a great evil in our days and has ruined many a man, who had he only been content to sit awhile on the students' bench might have been eminently successful in the ministry.—M.]. It is of course self-evident that the Apostle's warning is not directed against a great number of teachers as such, which on the contrary is in many respects useful and desirable (cf. Eph. iv. 11), but rather against an eager pressing into the Ministry of the Word, when men touch the Holy *illotis manibus*. The language of Homer: "*οὐκ ἀγαθὴ ἡ πολυκοιρανίη, εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω.*" ["The rule of many is not good, let there be one ruler"—M.], applies also to Church government.

3. The familiar saying of James "manifoldly we offend all" is frequently but erroneously taken and used as a *dictum probans* of the doctrine of the universal sinfulness of human nature. The author speaks not of men in general, but of Christians in particular. He considers not so much gross transgression as sins of infirmity and haste; and particularly the danger to which the hearer is less exposed than the teacher, namely the danger of offending in word. The preacher of the Gospel may very easily offend in word, on the one hand by setting forth his own perverse notions instead of the objectively given truth of salvation, or on the other by onesided preaching or by want of clearness and simplicity. Thus he may even involuntarily give offence and estrange his hearers, or on the other hand, he may lull them into a false sleep of peace and thus

do infinitely more harm than good with his preaching. How urgently ought he therefore to press the exhortation that men should not prematurely set themselves up as teachers, since probably they would do much better to continue disciples a little longer! Cf. Heb. v. 12. But this warning ought not to deter any one who sincerely desires to serve God in the ministry of the Word and truly loves the Lord and His Church. By watchfulness and prayer the servant of the Gospel may preserve himself from many sins of the tongue. The best corrective, in this respect, is doubtless the petition Ps. xix. 15; cxli. 3.

4. In order to form a correct estimate of the magnitude of the sins which Christians also commit with the tongue, first of all it must not be forgotten that the faculty of speech is originally a *Divine* gift bestowed on man. Compare Herder's *Origin of Language* (1770), a work which is still very valuable. This idea was not unfamiliar even to the pagans. Cf. Hesiod: ἔργα καὶ ἡμ., v. 79; Horat. *Od.* 1, 10, vv. 2, 3; Ovid, *Fastor.*, v. 667. See also Dr. J. C. Amman's *Dissertat. de loquela*, Amsterd. 1700, and especially Schubert, *History of the Soul*, 3d ed. 1839, p. 153–163. "The word uttered is only the outward sound of the begetting inward language of ideas through the corporeal medium." Ennemoser.

5. No Christian moralist may omit to bestow the greatest possible attention on the doctrine of James concerning the sins of the tongue. For speaking is also a doing and a doing of such daily and manifold occurrence, that its good and its evil consequences are all but incalculable. Compare the familiar French proverb: "*le style c'est l'homme*," and the motto of the well-known diplomatist Talleyrand "*le langage est donné* pour cacher *ses pensées*." No wonder that the Old Testament abounds in warnings against the perverse use of the tongue; see *e. g.* Ps. xv. 24, 34, and other passages.

6. In saying that "if any man offend not in word, he is a perfect man," James of course takes for granted, that such a mastery of the tongue is not solely the fruit of a politic wisdom, but rather the fruit of Christian self-control as the product of faith and love. He who has learned from this principle to set a watch before his lips, may with certainty be supposed to have attained so high a degree of discretion and life-wisdom, that to him the performance of any other duty cannot be particularly difficult, still less impossible. Cf. Prov. x. 19; xiii. 3; xvii. 27. But in order to obtain and to preserve the mastery of one's tongue, one must before have become master of one's most violent emotions and remain collected in one's intercourse with friends and enemies. Ps. xvi. 32. Cf. the language of Plutarch on this head: "*de capienda ex hostibus utilitate*," opp. ed. Reiskii, Tom. 6, p. 355 sq; also "*de garrulitate*," Tom. 8, p. 13 sqq.

7. "Plutarch (*de Auditione*, p. 137, and *in conviv. Sept.* p. 556, vol. 6, ed. Reiskii) relates that Amasis, King of Egypt sent a sacrifice to Bias and requested him to send back the best and the worst part thereof: Bias sent back the tongue." Heubner.

8. James who wrote his Epistle as a warning to believers, from the nature of the case could only advert to the *harm* caused by the abuse of the tongue, not (or only slightly) to the *profit* that might accrue to the cause of the Lord by the well-ordered use of the power of speech. To realize this *light-side* of the matter ought to be the daily effort of every Christian, but more particularly that of the Christian teacher.

9. The words of James (v. 9) would be unmeaning, if he meant that only the first man bore the likeness of God, which by the fall was wholly and eternally *lost* to his descendants. The ravaging power of sin is manifested not in the *potentiality* but in the *actuality* of man's likeness to God, and the *Conf. Belg.* art. 14, is therefore right in speaking of small remnants (*scintillulæ*) of the Divine image in fallen man, which are perfectly sufficient to take away all his excuses. [Art. IX. of the Articles of Religion in the Church of England and the Prot. Ep. Church in the U. S. says: "man is *very far* gone from original righteousness."—M.]. Lange (*Positive Dogmatik*, p. 299) is perfectly right in saying that "man is the image of God, *i. e.* the visible form of the Infinite in the totality of his being. The Being of God consists in His eternally embracing Himself perfectly in the clearness and liberty of His Being, in that He is the Absolute Spirit. And in like manner the being of the image of God consists in man's living in himself as a spirit, in his continually taking back the whole manifoldness of his existence into the unity of his consciousness and out of it re-forming it anew."

10. The doctrine of James (vv. 11, 12) exhibits a remarkable agreement with the sayings of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount (Matth. vii. 16–19; Luke vi. 43-45); a new proof that the publication of the fundamental law of the kingdom of heaven could not be forgotten by this servant of the Lord.

11. The bearing of James concerning the wisdom, which is from above (v. 13 etc.) is remarkable for its recalling not only many of the proverbs of Solomon but also many cognate ideas in Jesus Sirach and the Book of Wisdom. James, although occupying a purely evangelical standpoint, is nevertheless full of the ethical portion of the Old Testament, and in part even of the deutero-canonical writings. However it is impossible to examine the doctrine of this entire chapter more closely without discovering that the author himself has and exemplifies that heavenly wisdom, which in vv. 16, 17 he has so admirably and beautifully delineated as contrasted with earthly wisdom.

12. Very important is the connection of knowledge and life, on which James here insists. He who does not prove his wisdom by works, which have the seal of a meek disposition, contradicts himself and gives the lie to his confession of the Lord, which he is constantly making. He may boast in the possession of the truth but he is an opponent of the truth, if he does not receive it as the principle of his life; cf. 1 Jno. iv. 20, 21. His wisdom, as contrasted with that from above, is purely *earthly*, as contrasted with that of the pneumatical man purely *psychical*, as contrasted with that of good angels (cf. 1 Pet. i. 12), even *devilish*.

13. "The peaceable scatter in peace the seed of genuine Christian wisdom, which grows into

the harvest of righteousness. This applies not only to teachers but to every one who has received from God wisdom and the gift to influence others." Von Gerlach.

14. The seven qualities which James attributes to the wisdom from above (v. 17) are nothing but the seven colours of the one ray of light of heavenly truth, which has been revealed and has appeared in Christ Himself. He is therefore supremely entitled to the name "the Wisdom of God" (Luke xi. 49).

15. Even the closing sentences of this instruction reëcho notes from the Sermon on the Mount, Matth. v. 8, 9.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

A. vv. 1–12.

The lust of rule one of the most ancient diseases in the Church of Christ.—Even the manifold warnings of Christ (Matth. xviii. 1; Jno. xiii. 12–17 and other passages) have been insufficient hitherto to prevent disputes about precedency among those who confess Him.—The higher the position we hold before others, the greater will be our responsibility.—"Manifoldly we offend all." The remaining infirmity of the elect.—The truth, solemnity and comfort of this saying.—The use and abuse which may be and at different times have been made of this saying.—How the knowledge of our own, manifold infirmities ought to make us judge others leniently.—No matter how much the Christian may offend, he ought nevertheless to advance.—Christian self-control.—Man, lord of the animal creation but not lord of himself.—Even the bravest sailor suffers each time ship-wreck on the rocks of the tongue.—The power of the tongue evident 1, from the harm it can do, 2, from the utter impossibility of wholly subduing it.—The faculty of speech which makes man superior to the beasts is not seldom the means of making him inferior to them.—The sad part acted by the evil tongue in every century of the history of the Christian Church.—The sinful tongue is the sinful man. Sinful man is able to raise himself above every other irrational creature but he is unable to raise himself above his own nature.—That which is impossible with men, is possible with God.—The sad want of many men's conformity to their proper being.—How extremes meet also in the use of the tongue.—That which is never seen united in nature, is often simultaneously found present in men.—Man at once a lord and a slave (v. 5. "Behold how small a fire kindleth how great a forest.") Suitable text for a Reformation-sermon. [That is a sermon preached on the festival of the Reformation, which in Germany is kept October 31, the anniversary of Luther's fastening the 95 theses to the door of the Castle Church of Wittenberg A. D. 1517—M.].—There is not a thumb's breadth between our strong side and our weak side.—The melancholy inconsistency and the still sadder consistency of the abuse of the tongue.

STARKE:—He who wants to teach others in spiritual things, ought to be first well established himself. A man must be a pure and obedient sheep of Christ before he can become a shepherd. Hos. iv. 6.—Many, although they have not Divine wisdom and experience but possess only a literal knowledge, acquired not in the school of the Holy Ghost, but from the books and writings of men, straightway presume to be guides of the blind etc. Rom. ii. 18.

QUESNEL:—If all men have to observe caution in speech, how much more those, whose office requires them frequently and religiously to discourse of holy things? Rom. xv. 18.—Men must fairly strive to attain evangelical perfection, especially if they seek to be employed in the Ministry, 2 Tim. iii. 17.—

OSIANDER:—If a man is able to govern his tongue so effectually as not to utter any thing censurable, he is doubtless equally able so to govern and guide his body as not to indulge in any vice, Job xxvii. 4, 5.—Many men are more unruly than a horse—men whom God by the infliction of severe punishment has to make somewhat orderly. David cautions us against this disposition Ps. xxxii. 9.—If irrational creatures suffer themselves to be guided and ruled, how much rather ought rational creatures suffer it likewise? Is. i. 3.

LUTHER:—The tongue guides men either to virtue or to vice, 1 Cor. xv. 33.—The tongue of a Christian is ruled only with the bridle of faith and love, Ps. cxvi. 10.

QUESNEL:—Who knows not how to govern his tongue, is like a passenger on a ship without rudder in the open sea exposed to the fury of the storm.—If the rudder of our body is controlled by the Spirit of God, we sail in safety on the sea of the world, Rom. viii. 14.

CRAMER:—Many have fallen by the edge of the sword, but infinitely more by evil tongues, Sir. xxviii. 21.

LANGII OP.:—How easily may an uncircumcised and untamed tongue cause discord in a whole family, so that the best of friends fall out with one another! Sir. xxviii. 15, 16.—God has distinguished us from the brutes by the use of the tongue, and we are distinguished from one another by the good or evil use we make of it, Ps. cxix. 23.

HEDINGER:—Evil tongues and bad lungs have caused the death of many. The former spiritually and mostly. How much murder is committed with the tongue? how forward and swift is this poor member to wound the conscience? Whoso is wise puts a lock to his lips. Sir. xxii. 33—O God, create us a new tongue, that we may praise Thee! Prov. xviii. 21.—

QUESNEL:—There is no sin, of which the tongue may not be the cause and instrument, and which as a poisoned seed it may not contain, Matth. xv. 18.—Think, O ye liars and slanderers, how shameful and hurtful a member ye carry in your mouth! Ps. lvii. 5.—Whoso desires to be delivered from the sins of the tongue must particularly apply himself to work in faith at the bottom of his heart by repentance and renovation, Matth. xii. 33.—As the Holy Spirit did set on fire the tongues of the Apostles with godly zeal, so contrariwise the spirit of hell sets on fire the tongues of the ungodly with venom and great malice to crush the good name and reputation of their neighbour, Acts ii. 3, 4, 11.—The diligence of men is able to change the wildest natures of beasts! but none is able to change the

sinful nature of men, save the Wisdom and Omnipotence of God, Ez. xxxvi. 26.—God must needs take a coal from His altar and touch our tongue or it cannot be tamed. We stammer by nature like Moses, until God makes us eloquent, Is. vi. 5.—The tongue of the hellish serpent has thrown us into the greatest confusion, but the tongues of the Holy Ghost show us again the way to eternal peace, Acts ii. 4, 38.—We shun serpents, yet consort with people that carry poison in their mouths, Ps. xliv. 4; lv. 22.—How ill-suited it is that those should engage in the praises of God, the whole of whose lives dishonours God! A golden collar cannot be so ill-becoming to a sow covered with filth and dirt as the praise of God to a filthy sinner, Am. v. 23.—

Langii op.:—The nobility of human nature is very exalted and no man may offend it in word or deed without sinning against God, Gen. ix. 6. —We ought to honour the image of God in every man be he never so bad, 1 Jno. iv. 12.

Starke:—Man is so perverse, that there is nothing left in the world which is like him. He wants to render impossibilities possible, to do good and evil at the same time, which is contrary to the whole order of nature, Eccl. i. 15; Ps. lviii. 4.—If we want to show others their follies and sins, we must not do it in boisterous scolding, but in compassionating brotherly love, 2 Tim. ii. 24, 25.—Words are fruits enabling us to form an estimate of the heart, *i. e.* the tree which bears them; if this is pure, the others are not bad, Matth. xii. 23.

Stier:—Future accountability is solemn and difficult even in the case of our own soul. Who would lightly undertake to be accountable for the souls of others? Indeed is it not written, "Many are called but few chosen"—who will call himself in order to fall with so much more surety into condemnation? Many did it then, and alas! many do it now. "But howsoever, let me, I pray thee, also run after Cushi," said Ahimaaz the son of Zadok, and would not be dissuaded when he was told "thou hast no good tidings ready." He stuck to his "let me run." (2 Sam. xviii. 19–23). There are many such teachers and runners, who are not sent. They surely are not the true teachers and masters that shall shine as the brightness of the firmament (Dan. xii. 3),—but they will stand illy.—"Manifoldly we offend all"—James includes himself in this confession in order to put to shame the proud brethren. Not indeed that he intended to expose the supposed errors of his Divinely-inspired Epistle to their criticism or now to ours, but he rather meant solemnly to assert respecting life in general apart from the sacred office, that the perfect man who does not even trip in a word, cannot be found anywhere. Even the Apostles were assuredly not sinless, holy and infallible in their daily and hourly private life; the promise of the Holy Ghost to guard them from all error related only to their sacred office, just as it was with reference to their office and the principal and fundamental truths of their message that the seventy as well as the twelve were told "He that heareth you, heareth me."—Although the proud tongue may boast, I can be silent, or I can thoroughly dissemble myself—it is a thing beyond its control, there it is brought to shame. The most expert hypocrite can never reach such a point of dissembling as to prevent its failing him even in a word; the heart runs over, the hell within bursts out on the tongue. Our speech is and remains the nearest, surest and most irresistible effluence of the heart. What follows lastly from James's sermon against the sins of the tongue? Whither they lead—to the world full of unrighteousness, whence they come—from the inward abyss of corruption —he has shown; it is not difficult to apply here the only remedy.

Heubner:—We are more on our guard with respect to sins in deed than with respect to sins in word.—Whoso fails to govern his tongue is like a rider on an unruly horse, or like a sailor in a ship without a rudder.—The tongue is a channel which transmits the evil of hell.—An *unconditional* impossibility to tame the tongue does not exist. If thy tongue is cursing, it is unfitted for praise.

Viedebandt:—The rule of the tongue is more important than the rule of the world.—What an evil full of deadly poison is many a newspaper tongue!—If Satan has your heart, he also rules your tongue. The tongue and the heart are only a span apart.

Neander:—James attacks the being of mock piety at all points. Such is that pious cant which while it utters the praises of God in words, hatefully censures and condemns men, in whom the image of God ought to be honoured, aside. —Thus James points out the fundamental idea of this whole Epistle, that everything depends on that disposition which gives direction to a man's whole life, the recognition of which truth was as remote as possible from that tendency, attacked by him at all points, which only considers the outward, single acts, and the appearance of things.

Jakobi:—The Apostle shows from the harmony, visible in universal creation, that it is unnatural and therefore ungodly and therefore displeasing to God if the same tongue is used in the service of heaven and hell, and if praises and curses proceed out of the same mouth God, says another Apostle, is a God of order. Because the fig-tree, the olive tree and the vine bear fruit each according to its kind, figs, olives and grapes, and because sweet fountains and salt fountains always send forth the same kind of water and because of this order in nature, God rejoices in all his works (Ps. civ. 31), and looking down from heaven upon the earth, behold, all things are very good. Therefore it cannot be good and well-pleasing to God, if contrary to the Divinely appointed order the gifts and faculties intrusted to man are employed in opposite uses, if the same tongue which has just stammered the praise of God, utters shameful words, folly and unseemly jests. Therefore as long as this continues to be done among Christians, so long as we who have just had on our tongue the sweet word of God, indulge in bitter revilings of those who share with us the greatest of all blessings, as long as out of the same opening of the mouth there flow such sweet and such bitter streams, so long the sad dissension of sin continues in us and we do not yet stand in the unity and truth of the Divine life.

LISCO:—The sins of the tongue: 1. They are of all sins the most corrupt; 2, They are of all sins, the most difficult to be avoided.—He who governs himself solves the problem of the Christian life.—The tongue 1, is the communicator of our thoughts and 2, ought to be solely the mediator of good.

PORUBSZKY: (vv. 1, 2):—Religious conversation in social life.—(vv. 3-12). The tongue of scandal.

BECK:—Three golden rules for a Christian's life: 1, have humility in your heart (vv. 1, 2), 2, have truth in your mouth (vv. 3-9), 3, practise faithfulness in your life (vv. 10-12).

W. HOFACKER (Sermons p. 635):—Our speaking tongue one of the greatest gifts of God's grace.

Vv. 1-10. Epistle for the 16th Sunday after Trinity in the Grand Duchy of Hesse and elsewhere.

GEROK:—Watch thy tongue: 1, It looks so little and so small 2, Yet worketh such great things for all; 3, Kindles many a fire of hell, 4, Yet heaven has ordered it so well [German: 1, *Sie ist nur klein und scheint gering* 2, *und richtet an so grosse Ding;* 3, *sie hat manch Höllenfeuer entflammt* 4, *und führt doch ein so himmlish Amt.*—M.].

RUPERTI:—Several oft-forgotten duties to be practised by the Christian in order that he may become master of his tongue in his intercourse with others.

ALT:—The evil word towards one's neighbour.

B. vv. 13-18.

VV. 13-18. Epistle for Quinquagesima Sunday in the Grand Duchy of Hesse and elsewhere.

The difference between abstract knowledge of Christian truth and true life-wisdom.—The tree is known by its fruit.—Meek wisdom the crown of Christian virtue.—The intimate union of truth and love on Christian ground. The wisdom which is from above, and the wisdom which is from beneath; the sevenfold more exalted character of the former and the threefold baseness of the latter.—The wisdom from above: 1, how it is evidenced, 2, how it is rewarded, 3, how it is learned.—The harvest feast of the peaceable: 1, the seed, 2, the fruit, 3, the harvest-joy; here in its beginning, hereafter in its perfection.—James himself is in his Epistle a continuing proof of the truth of what he says, vv. 13-18.

STARKE:—The possession of a natural, wise, prudent understanding is a great gift of God, but to be truly enlightened with the light of truth is invaluable, Prov. iii. 13; 2 Cor. iv. 6.

CRAMER:—Our Christianity is then inseparable, for a good understanding have all they that do His commandments, Ps. cxi. 10.—Many men's meekness is a worm-eaten fruit of nature. They are rather tamed lions than meek sheep of Christ, Matth. xi. 29.—

NOVA BIBL. TÜB.:—Wisdom and meekness are noble virtues which ought to regulate the whole of our conversation; they are the springs of all other virtues, Prov. xix. 2.—Those who are ready to dispute and quarrel and are ever at odds with their neighbour, exhibit an infallible token that they are still lacking true wisdom, Prov. xviii. 6; xx. 3.—

QUESNEL:—A teacher above all things should be an enemy of all disputing and contention, 2 Tim. ii. 24.

CRAMER:—Cunning is not wisdom. Hence little wisdom in the fear of God is better than much wisdom allied to contempt of God, Sir. xix. 21.—

QUESNEL:—The wisdom of the world is very different from the wisdom of the Gospel. It is only cunning wisdom whose end is to rule on earth, but which is ruled itself by nothing but brutal lusts, 1 Cor. i. 21; ii. 7, 8.—Sin punishes itself even in this world, because man in the service of it does not enjoy his life on account of the great trouble and annoyance to which sin puts him, Ps. xxxii. 10.—

CRAMER:—As smoke causes pain to the eyes and prevents their seeing distinctly, so it happens to reason and wisdom, for if it is disturbed by the passions, it cannot see any thing and decide what is white or black, right or wrong.—The most simple Christian who practises these seven qualities of virtue will be wiser than the seven sages of Greece. Remember only one for each day of the week.—Those who scatter the poison of their evil heart in anger, contention and brawling, will reap from it the unhappy fruit of eternal trouble, tribulation and anguish, Rom. ii. 8, 9.—Be content, ye peacemakers, if your souls are afraid to dwell with those that hate peace, (Ps. cxx. 6), remember that ye shall hereafter dwell forever in a peaceable habitation, Is. xxxii. 18.—

STIER:—To be only prudent and understanding does not amount to much and is a very doubtful and suspicious thing, but to be wise and prudent, that is the right thing.—Every good gift as well as true wisdom is from *above*, but that which is passed off for it with lying against the truth, all false wisdom is not from heaven, but earthly; not from the Spirit of God but human, from man's soul, flesh and blood; not from Christ the King of the kingdom of God, the destroyer of the works of the devil, but rather devilish still, from the influence and seduction of evil spirits. Indeed on this profound saying of James might be written a history of all knowledge falsely so called, of all so-called philosophy or even theology.—All the trouble and confusion in the Church, all the disorder and unruliness or rebellion of self-will opposing the Spirit of God originates in the brawling of carnality; hence schism, factions, sects, hence other evils and particularly also evil hypocrisy under coërced unity. Even in the world and in things earthly a family and many a city give unceasing testimony that good cannot mature under the influence of envy and contention, but that these conduce to nothing but evil. Still more lamentable and ravaging are the contentions concerning God's Word in the house and city of God, the carnal wrangling of brethren and members in Christ.—Many are officiously engaged in imparting to others opinions, which are their truths and in disputing away errors—but where is the good fruit of all these efforts? whom have they improved thereby, converted and won for the kingdom of heaven? On the other hand look at many quiet people in the land: they make no noise, they do not deal in great things, they walk everywhere in meekness and gentleness—but wherever they go they carry something along

with them, which passes from them like a breath of life;—the words which they utter at the right time, are seeds—all their walk and work burst into fruitfulness around them with a silent, deep power, and many things are recorded on high as the fruit of their righteousness, whereof men know and suspect nothing. Grace works by them, they live in love and this is their deep power.—"*Fruits*, gentlemen, fruits that shall make men whole." It was this which the king of Prussia demanded of the University of Königsberg, and truly it was a great royal word, a Solomonic word, in its time. Wholesome, healthy fruits will grow where healthy seed has been sown, but the seed itself had before grown as the produce of ripe fruit; thus righteousness is sown and transmitted from one to another.

HEUBNER: (v. 15).—This is a description truly applicable to those who by their writings,—either immoral, provoking vice, or irreligious, undermining the faith of Christians—especially if they exhibit skill and genius, have exerted the influence of devils upon the world. The subtle and disguised ones are the worst; subtle poison insinuates itself most thoroughly.—Earthly wisdom effects nothing good for eternity.—

NEANDER:—Holy Scripture often designates, by the name of the flesh, all evil, whatever is opposed to the Spirit of God, to the Divine life. If the word is used in this general sense, it includes also man's spiritual nature, reason and the soul, as far as it has not been made subject to the Divine Spirit, but persists in its selfish being, pretends to be something by itself, independent of God, without (*extra*) God and hence opposed to Him. The term flesh in this biblical sense includes all these ideas. Its meaning is by no means restricted to what we call flesh, sensuality in the narrower sense of the word. Now if we take *flesh* in this more general sense, biblical usage distinguishes it from that which in the narrower sense is designated as psychical, *i.e.*, the spiritual [part of man], as far as it is made not to conform to God, but to conform to the world [German: "In sofern es nicht vergöttlicht ist, sondern verweltlicht."]. Reason however cultivated remains still within the sphere of the psychical [*i. e.* the rational soul not only not influenced by the Divine Spirit but rather influenced by the physical and the cosmical. The German for psychical is *seelisch*, as stated before.—M.]. The seed of whatever is truly good in action, proceeding from righteousness, can only prosper where peace reigns and with those, the end and aim of whose actions is peace. Where all is strife, nothing truly Christian can prosper.

JAKOBI (on the feast of the ingathering of the harvest):—What a description of wisdom! Truly such wisdom cometh from above, from the Father of Light with whom every thing is light, and pure and holy; thence it cometh as the best and most perfect light, communicated by Him, in whom is treasured up the fulness of all good, communicated by the Son of Eternal Wisdom and Love to all those, who renouncing earthly, human and devilish wisdom, and looking to Him alone in simplicity of faith, suffer Him to create in them a pure heart and receive a new sure spirit, the spirit of truth, which is also for this very reason the spirit of true wisdom.

PORUBSZKY:—Wisdom in action.—Envy sets us at variance 1, with God, 2, with man, 3, with ourselves.—

BECK:—Heavenly wisdom the fountain of earthly peace.

SCHMALTZ: The fire of discord.

KÖSTLIN:—Of true, Christian wisdom as contrasted with false, earthly wisdom.

ALT:—With the wisdom of Christians we will overcome the evil of time.

[v. 2. BARROW:—To *offend* originally signifies to *impinge* (*infringe*), to stumble upon somewhat lying across our way, so as thereby to be cast down, or at least to be disordered in our posture, and stopped in our progress: whence it is well transferred to our being through any incident temptation brought into sin, whereby a man is thrown down, or bowed from his upright state and interrupted from prosecuting a steady course of piety and virtue. By an opposite manner of speaking (Ps. xxxvii. 23, 24) our tenor of life is called *a way*, our conversation *walking*, our actions *steps*, our observing good laws *uprightness*, our transgression of them *tripping*, *faltering*, *falling*. By *not offending in word*, we may then conceive to be understood such a constant restraint and such a careful guidance of our tongue, that it doth not transgress the rules prescribed by the Divine law, or by good reason; that it thwarteth not the natural ends and proper uses for which it was framed, to which it is fitted; such as chiefly are promoting God's glory, our neighbour's benefit, and our own true welfare.—

— A constant governance of our speech according to duty and reason is a high instance and a special argument of a thoroughly sincere and solid goodness.—

— The offences of speech are various. 1. Some of them are committed against God, and confront piety; 2. others against our neighbour, and violate justice, charity, or peace; 3. others against ourselves, infringing sobriety, discretion, or modesty; 4. some are of a more general and abstracted nature, rambling through all matters, and crossing all the heads of duty.—

Cf. on this subject Dr. Barrow's sermon on this text; Bp. Butler on the Government of the Tongue, an abstract of which is here given; Bp. Taylor's Sermons on the Good and Evil Tongue; On Slander and Flattery; On the Duties of the Tongue.

Abstract of Butler's Sermon on the Government of the Tongue. (Bohn's edition.)

"One of the most material restraints under which virtue places us in the obligation of 'bridling the tongue.'" Let us then ask

1. What vice is opposed to this precept? and
2. When can a man be fairly said to act up to it?

1. The vice alluded to is not evil-speaking from malice, nor from selfish design. It is *talkativeness* or a disposition to talk at random without thought of doing either good or harm. Now talkative persons, when other subjects fail them, will indulge in scandal or divulge secrets; or, further, they will go on to invent matter, and all in order to engage attention; and if a quarrel ensue, they will defame and revile their enemy, but without malice.

As all our faculties may be made instruments of evil, so also the tongue. Deliberate and wilful

falsehood, indulged in from malice or revenge, does not arise from having no government of the tongue. But there is a vicious habit, without malice, which arises from a desire to arrest attention; and in these people the very least thing excites the tongue, and so gives birth to innumerable evils, especially to strife. Its effects are often as bad as those of malice or envy; it wrongly distributes praise and blame, and, being used at random, always does harm.

2. In what does the government of the tongue consist? We are to measure our faculties by the end for which they have been given to us. The end of speech clearly is to communicate our thoughts to each other, either for real business or for enjoyment. In this secondary use, it contributes to promote friendship, and so is serviceable to virtue and its tendency is to general good.

Corresponding to these two uses is the abuse of speech. As to its primary end, *deceit in business* does not come within our scope. It is in its secondary sense that it becomes the object of our inquiry, for the government of the tongue relates chiefly to what we call *Conversation.* Certain cautions are to be observed in governing the tongue. First, that there is a fit time to speak and a time to keep silence. This rule is too often forgotten; and they who forget it, too often, if they amuse at all, amuse at their own expense. The times for silence are when they are in company of their superiors, or when the discourse is of subjects above themselves; and these obvious rules are generally passed over by those who in their talkative mood forget that the very essence of conversation is that it should be mutual, and talkative persons are generally disregarded. Men, then, should be silent, both when they have nothing to say, or nothing but what were better left unsaid.—

In talking on indifferent subjects, the first rule is not to spend too much time on them; the second, to be quite sure, that they *are* indifferent. Conversation about other people and their matters is often very dangerous; as in such cases we cannot always be indifferent and neutral, or escape being drawn into rivalry. But as we cannot entirely avoid speaking of others, we should take care that what we say, be true. It is important to know the characters of the bad as well as the good, and abuse will scarcely follow, if these two rules be observed: 1st, That to speak evil of a man undeservedly is worse than to speak good of him undeservedly, for the former is a direct injury to the person as well as to society. 2nd, That a good man will always speak all the good which he can of his fellows, and never any harm unless he has some positive reason for so doing; for example, just indignation against villany, or to prevent the innocent from being deceived. For we must always study justice: and we do justice to society at large by exposing bad characters.

Those who observe the above cautions and precepts have due government over their tongues. —M.].

[v. 3. Wordsworth:—St. James follows up the metaphor of the preceding verse with an argument *a fortiori.* We can rule irrational animals with a bit; how much more ought we to be able to govern ourselves! And if we rule our *tongues*, we do in fact govern the whole man; for the tongue is to man what a bit is to horses, and a rudder is to ships; it rules the whole; let it therefore be governed aright.—M.].

[v. 5. Virgil, Georgic 2, 303.

"Nam sæpe incautis pastoribus excidit ignis,
Qui furtim pingui primùm sub cortice tectus
Robora comprendit, frondesque elapsus in altas
Ingentem cœlo sonitum dedit; inde secutus
Per ramos victor, perque alta cacumina regnat
Et *totum involvit flammis nemus;* et ruit atram
Ad coelum piceâ crassus fuligine nubem;
Præsertim si tempestas à vertice sylvis
Incubuit, glomeratque ferens incendia ventus."

For the benefit of those not familiar with Latin, I subjoin Davidson's translation. The quotation itself *mutatis mutandis* forcibly illustrates the incendiary ravages of the tongue.

"For fire is often let fall from the unwary shepherds
Which at first secretly lurking under the unctuous bark,
Catches the solid wood, and shooting up into the topmost leaves,
Raises a loud crackling to heaven: thence pursuing its way,
Reigns victorious among the branches and the lofty tops,
Involves the whole grove in flames, and darts the black
Cloud to heaven, condensed in pitchy vapor;
Chiefly if a storm overhead rests its fury on the woods,
And the driving wind whirls the flames aloft."—M.].

[v. 6. Wordsworth:—*That world of iniquity*, that universe of mischief, as containing within it the *elements* of all mischief; as the world contains within itself mineral combustibles and volcanic fires, and electric fluid, which may blaze forth into a conflagration.

— By the faculty of speech man is distinguished from the rest of creation: by it his thoughts are borne, as upon eagles' wings, to the remotest shores, and are carried to distant ages; by it they are endued with the attributes of omnipresence and immortality; by it men are reclaimed from savage ignorance; by it cities are built and are peopled, laws promulgated, alliances formed, leagues made; by it men are excited to deeds of heroic valor, and to prefer eternity to time, and the good of their country to their own; through it the affairs of the world are transacted; it negotiates the traffic of commerce, and exchanges the produce of our soil and climate for that of another; it pleads the cause of the innocent, and checks the course of the oppressor; it gives vent to the tenderest emotions; it cheers the dreariness of life. By it virtuous deeds of men are proclaimed to the world with a trumpet's voice; by it the memory of the dead is kept alive in families. It is the teacher of arts and sciences, the interpreter of poetic visions, and of subtle theories of philosophy; it is the rudder and helm by which the state of the world is steered; it is the instrument by which the Gospel of Christ is preached to all nations, and the Scriptures sound in the ears of the Church, and the world unites in prayer and praise to the Giver of all good, and the chorus of Saints and Angels pours forth hallelujahs before His throne.

Such being the prerogatives of speech, it is a heinous sin to pervert the heavenly faculty, to insult the Name of the Giver Himself, or to injure man, made in the image of God. All true Christians will put away profane and impure language, calumny and slander, injurious to God's honour, the welfare of society, and their own eternal salvation. They will ab-

hor it worse than pestilence, and they will pray to Him from whom are the preparations of the heart, and who maketh the dumb and the deaf, the seeing and the blind, who quickened the slow speech of His servant Moses, and put words of fire into his mouth, and whose Spirit on the Day of Pentecost descended in tongues of fire on the Apostles, and filled them with holy eloquence, so to direct their thoughts and words, that both now and hereafter they may ever sing His praise. —M.].

[v. 10. VAYIKRA RABBA: § 33:—"Rabbi Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, said to his servant Tobias, Go and bring me some *good food* from the market: the servant went and brought *tongues*. At another time, he said to the same servant, Go and buy me some *bad food:* the servant went and bought *tongues*. The master said, What is the reason that when I ordered thee to buy me *good* and *bad* food, thou didst bring *tongues?* The servant answered, From the *tongue* both *good* and *evil* come to man: if it be *good*, there is nothing *better;* if *bad*, there is nothing *worse*."—M.].

[v. 13. PYLE:—Whatever Christian convert or Jewish zealot, therefore, would be indeed a master of religious wisdom, let him show his wisdom first in the suppression of this wretched habit, and in reducing himself to a meek and charitable disposition towards his brethren.—M.].

[v. 14. BP. HALL:—Never brag vainly that ye are Christians: and do not shame and contradict that truth which ye profess, by a real denial of the profession thereof.—M.].

[v. 16. WORDSWORTH:—Strife and party-spirit would destroy Sion, and can build up nothing but Babel. Cf. Bp. Sanderson I. pp. 214, 350; and see Clemens Rom. I. capp. 3–9.—M.].

[HERBERT:—

Be calm in arguing, for *fierceness* makes
Error a fault and *truth discourtesy:*
Why should I feel another man's mistakes
More than his *sickness* or his *poverty?*
In *love* I should: but *anger* is not *love;*
Nor *wisdom* neither; therefore *gently move.*
—M.].

[—*Fortiter in re, leniter in modo.*—M.]

[On the meaning and use of the term "*wisdom from above*" see Schoettgen; illustrations:

1. SOHAR, *Yalcut Rubeni* f. 19: "*The wisdom from above* was in Adam more than in the supreme angels: and he knew all things."

2. *Sohar Chadath*, f. 35: "The angels were sent from above and taught him (*Enoch*) the *wisdom that is from above*."—Ibid. f. 42, 4. "Solomon came, and he was perfect in all things, and strongly set forth the praises of the *wisdom that is from above*."

For particular texts consult the following, besides the above:

v. 1. BP. BULL: The priest's office difficult and dangerous. Visitation Sermon. Works 1, 187.

v. 2. BARROW: Not to offend in word, an evidence of a high pitch of virtue. Works 1.

vv. 14–17. ABP. WHATELY: Party-spirit. Bampton Lecture 33.

v. 16. SOUTH: The nature, causes and consequences, of envy. Sermons, 5, 389.

v. 17. LEIGHTON: The nature and properties of heavenly wisdom. Works, 3, 86. —M.].

VII. FIFTH ADMONITION.

REFERENCE TO THE INFALLIBLE TOKEN OF AN UNSPIRITUAL (FANATICAL) MENTAL CONSTITUTION FOUNDED ON WORLDLY-MINDEDNESS, VIZ.: THE WARS AND FIGHTINGS IN THE JEWISH CHRISTIAN WORLD AND PARTICULARLY IN THE JEWISH WORLD BOTH INWARDLY AND OUTWARDLY.—THE CONSEQUENCE THEREOF: FAILURE AND FRUSTRATION OF THEIR STRIVING, THEIR MURDEROUS ENVYING, THEIR WARRING AND EVEN OF THEIR PRAYING.

CHAPTER IV. 1–3.

1 From whence *come* wars and[1] fightings among you? *come they* not hence, *even* of your
2 lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and
3 cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet[2] ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask[3], and
receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume *it* upon your lusts.

Verse 1. [1] A. B. C. Cod Sin. and al. insert a second πόθεν.
Lange: Whence then [are] wars and whence fightings among you? Is it not hence: from your lusts, which [especially] wage war in your members.
[Whence *are* . . . ? Are they not . . . —M.]

Verse 2. [2] Rec. and some minuscules read δὲ after ἔχετε. A. B. G. K. οὐκ ἔχετε; C. Cod. Sin. Vulg. Griesbach and al. καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε.
Lange: Ye desire it and ye have it not, ye murder and ye strive and ye cannot obtain it; ye fight and ye make war, and ye get it not, because ye ask not.
[Ye desire and ye have not: ye commit murder and ye envy, and are not able to obtain; ye fight and make war, and ye have not, because ye ask not.—M.]

Verse 3. [3] Notice the interchange of αἰτεῖτε and αἰτεῖσθε. Cod. Sin. intensifies the last word of this sentence into καταδαπ.
Lange: Ye ask and receive it not, because ye ask illy [desirable in your interest] that ye may waste it in your lusts.
[Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may spend *it* in your lusts.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Analysis:—See above in summary of contents. The Apostle comes now to worldly-mindedness [*i. e.* the lust of the world—M.] which lies at the bottom of the fanatical zeal of teaching and wrangling described in the preceding chapter. He began with the appearance of visionariness (ch. 1), passed on to party-spirit (ch. ii.), then portrayed fanatical striving in its outward aspect (ch. iii.) in order to come now to the inward disruptions and breaches among the readers of his Epistle and to worldly-mindedness, which is really the root from which they spring. By and by (ch. iv. 4 etc.) we shall meet it in the shape of selfishness and a bias to apostasy (ch. v.), as self-righteousness ripe unto judgment. The Apostle moreover passes more and more from the Jewish Christians to the Judaizing Christians and from these to the real Judaistic Jews themselves. *This suggests the remark that James put this Epistle into the hands of the Jewish Christians in order that it might influence all Jews, as it were,* as a missionary instruction to the converted over against the unconverted, and to the rightly-converted over against the badly-converted. Notice the rapid transition from the thought immediately preceding, viz.: that righteousness can prosper only *in peace*, to the impressive question: πόθεν πόλεμοι, the answer to which is contained in a second question appealing (Wiesinger) to the conscience of the readers (Huther).

Ver. 1. **Whence then are wars and whence fightings?**—Not only dogmatical disputes between the teachers (Schneckenburger), or civil contentions concerning "*meum*" and "*tuum*" (de Wette). It is a true picture of the hostile dissensions of the Jewish people. Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Alexandrians, Samaritans—on this basis sprung up nothing but new dissensions; believing or Christian and unbelieving Jews. The former contained as yet in the germ the opposites of Nazarenes and Ebionites, of Essene-gnostic and Pharisaic-vulgar Ebionites, the latter the shocking discord which appeared in the Jewish war and during the siege of Jerusalem. The πόλεμοι were the basis: *the condition of war* [warlike attitude], the μάχαι, single quarrels and fightings, which certainly partook occasionally of the character of skirmishes and at a later period even of battles; this is denied by Laurentius: "*non loquitur Apostolus de bellis et cædibus, sed de mutuis dissidiis, litibus, jurgiis et contentionibus.*" [Alford renders "*militate.*" To act the soldier is the real meaning of στρατευομένων.—M.].

Is it not hence?—The explanation; for ἐντεῦθεν is not a separate question: from hence? (Michaelis).

From your lusts.—ἡδοναί are more than ἐπιθυμίαι (Huther); they are desires actualized, a life of sensual indulgence (Luther: voluptuousness, *Wollüste*). These wage war chiefly *in the members*. The members need hardly be emphasized as being the camp of the lusts (Wiesinger); nor is the idea that they war against the soul (Rom. vii. 23; 1 Pet. ii. 11; de Wette) the leading idea. Theile, Schneckenburger and others rightly apply the term to the war of the lusts among themselves. Huther thinks it denotes an *inward* warfare against our fellow-men, but ἡδοναί would hardly be the most suitable word to bring out that idea. We might however think of the members in a restricted and in a wider sense; the members of individuals and the members of the people. From the individual Jew, whose lusts become inimically opposed in his members, the division and dissension between spiritual selfishness and vain worldly-mindedness are communicated to the members of the whole nation. Wiesinger thinks the fightings denote opposition of the ἐπιθυμεῖν and the οὐκ ἔχειν. The fruitless struggling however is only an appearance and a judgment of this fighting. It is described in four gradations: 1, desiring; 2, murdering and envying; 3, fighting and warring; 4, praying and not receiving. To the first corresponds not having, to the second not obtaining, to the third an increased not having, to the fourth an increased not receiving. The first grade denotes Judaism full of chiliastic worldly-mindedness up to the time of the New Testament. The second grade describes particularly the attitude of the Jews towards the Christians. The third grade comprises the development of the Jewish war. The fourth is mainly the history of Judaism after the destruction of Jerusalem. Such a definite mapping out of periods was of course not intended by the Apostle, but it describes the process of the development of Judaism as unfolded by history. The common construction that the reference here is either to the desire of individuals or of entire churches, and the limitation of the object of that desire to worldly riches and glory are inadequate to the prophetical relation in which James stood to his people. [Alford cites a remarkable parallel from Plato, *Phædo.* p. 66, c: καὶ γὰρ πολέμους καὶ στάσεις καὶ μάχας οὐδὲν ἄλλο παρέχει ἢ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἱ τούτου ἐπιθυμίαι.—M.].

Ver. 2. **Ye desire it and ye have it not.**—The indefinite object at all events is implied; in the most general sense the object of the chiliastico-judaistic longing for the world [*Weltsehnsucht*, *i. e.* longing for the dominion of the world—M.], in the utmost variety of form and colour, nominally the fruit of righteousness, ch. iii. 18. The antithesis pregnantly expresses the fruitlessness of the struggle. *Ye have not* has of course also the sense: ye receive not (de Wette); but it declares at the same time that they receive not, because they have not, because they are empty (Luke xix. 26). [Desire is not possession; there is many a slip between the cup and the lip.—M.].

Ye murder and ye envy.—This strong expression has induced commentators to submit various modifications of it arising from their supposition that the Apostle here addresses only Christians and refers as yet only to the internal dissensions among the members themselves. Ye kill your own soul (Oecumenius), *ye envy* (according to the conjectured reading φθονεῖτε, Erasmus, Calvin and many others), *ye hate* (according to the doctrine that hatred is murder in thought 1 Jno. iii. 15. Luther, Estius, Wiesinger, Huther) ye strive even to murder and death (Carpzov, Schneckenburger). Winer rightly advocates the literal sense of the term. That ζηλοῦτε

is not mentioned first proves nothing: for the two terms are not intended to a stronger and a weaker degree of conduct, but the negative and positive sides of their conduct. They committed murder because they thought they were zealous for the glory of God. With their striving they were hunting for the fleshly ideal of the glorifying of their religion. On that account also *murder* must come first. The twelve tribes, however, who had already killed the Lord Himself and Stephen, who were in part responsible for the death of the Baptist and James the son of Zebedee, who had already shown the disposition to kill Paul, and who soon after did kill the author of the Epistle himself, had to submit to this address; the Christians among them were at least sympathizing with these national offences. But their acts of murder and strife were wholly in vain, as were afterwards the acts of the inquisition, the hierarchical judicial murders and religious wars of the zeal of the middle ages from the Crusade against the Albigenses to the Thirty years' War. Ye do not attain your terrible, hypocritical end, the Babel of conscience-monarchy in the pseudo-glory of Zion.

Ye fight and ye make war.—These words are not merely explanatory of πόλεμοι v. 1 (Huther), for the primary reference is no longer to the quarrels among the Jews themselves. Their individual words become at last open fighting, and this leads to open warfare. Hence οὐκ ἔχετε is repeated here, and, as we read with Griesbach and Lachmann, with καὶ preceding it, "and yet ye have not, *i. e.* ye get it not." We join this with what goes before in order to constitute the third antithesis, not with what follows (Huther) to introduce the specification of the cause of all their disappointments.—Not till then follows the reason, not only of the frustration of their warring, but also of their murderous striving and desiring. All lacks the true life of prayer, which purifies, hallows and adjusts our efforts to the Divine disposition of affairs. But the probable protestation of the Judaists: "we pray much," prompts the Apostle to add an ironical self-correction which brings out the fourth and most terrible antithesis. Their asking (αἰτεῖν) is evil praying (αἰτεῖσθαι. The Apostle having introduced an interchange of Active and Middle—see Winer, p. 297: Matthiä II. p. 1097.—he may here either take the Active as denoting importunate asking or the Middle as denoting egotistical praying for oneself. The latter is probably intended.), and for the reason that they pray for the help of Jehovah for a fulness of prosperity which they intend to squander in the lusts of their worldly mind. We have here to remind the reader of the visionary expectations of the Jews during the destruction of Jerusalem, of their gloomy lamentations in the post-christian synagogue (how they make God Himself weep over the unhappiness of His people) and of their vain, worldly striving and their description of the most sensual carousals in the future Kingdom of God.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is indeed a sad contrast if we oppose the name of Christ as that of the Prince of Peace (Is. ix. 6) to the wretched quarrels and disputes of those who call themselves Christians and yet not uncommonly carry on such quarrels in His name. The question of James "Whence are wars and whence fightings among you?" may be addressed with equal pertinence to the countless sects and parties in just as many Christian communities in every age of the Church's history. The cause is really still the same now which it was in the Apostolic age, viz.: the carnal mind which exhibits the selfishness of the natural man, after he has been baptized. The Church of Christ, which ought to be a Zion of peace, has in consequence become a Babel of confusion. But the serpent-seed of discord bears even now the same unhappy fruit which it did then. The sword which the loveless man turns against his brother, wounds his own hands, and in proportion as men covet what is their neighbour's, they themselves grow poorer in true peace.

2. There is no greater enemy of the true spirit of prayer than the spirit of quarrelsomeness and contention, cf. 1 Pet. iii. 7. It is impossible to find faith where love is wanting; how then can the unbelieving prayer of an ἀνὴρ δίψυχος (cf. ch. i. 6-8) obtain any thing at the Lord's hand? Many a complaint of prayers not answered would surely cease, if men did not confine themselves to hearing their hearts only concerning the disappointment they have experienced, but would also examine their consciences concerning hidden guilt, which renders the hearing of prayer on the part of God morally impossible. Cf Is. i. 11-15.

3. Prayer in order to be well-pleasing to God must ever go hand-in-hand with a God-consecrated life. There is no greater horror in the sight of God than prayer which irreconcilably contradicts the inward and outward life. Cf. Prov. xxviii. 9; Ps. xxxiv. 16, 17.

4. The Christian is permitted to pray also for outward things, provided it be done in the spirit of absolute submission and resignation to the Divine Will, to the glory of His name and in the name of Christ. The rule Matth. vi. 33, applies also here. If this mind is wanting, prayer will not be followed by peace filling the heart, and this very want of true peace consequent upon prayer is an intimation that we need not expect the fulfilment of the desire uttered by us in prayer. Cf. *Conférences sur la prière, par* J. Martin, Paris, 1849, p. 111 etc.

5. Prayer is evil first respect of the object, if we pray for some vain, unprofitable or foolish thing; secondly in consideration of the disposition, if we pray in a vain, covetous and boisterous spirit, that is without submission and filial trust, without leaving every thing at the disposal of God. Heubner.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The disputes and quarrels in the Christian Church—a great proof how little the wisdom which is from above is understood and practised, ch. iii. 16.—Every sensual and selfish lust which is not killed in the heart of the Christian, sooner or later must work disastrously to the detriment of fraternal communion.—Disappointed hopes should not fill us with bitterness and hatred

against one another, but rather prompt us to humility and believing, confiding prayer.—It is not sufficient to pray only, all depends upon the manner *how* we pray and in what spirit.—God not a God of disorder, but a God of peace in all churches of the saints, cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 33.—The history of prayers that have not been heard. Examples: Deut. iii. 26; Jno. xi. 3-6; 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9 etc.—Prayer the true thermometer of the spiritual life.—He who prays illy need not expect more than he who prays not at all.—What our Lord said to Salome applies to many a praying man, Matth. xx. 22.—In prayer we must not think first and foremost of ourselves, but chiefly of the glory of God and the welfare of our neighbour.—A Christian prays not that he may bend the will of God according to his will, but in order that he may shape his will according to God's.—No prayer without work, no work without prayer.—

By caring and by fretting,
By agony and fear,
There is of God no getting,
But prayer He will hear.

Mit Sorgen und mit Grämen
Und mit selbsteigner Pein,
Lässt Gott sich gar nichts nehmen,
Es muss erbeten sein. cf. Ps. cxxvii. 1, 2.

STARKE:—Even with believers Satan attempts to bring about all manner of evil. He sows tares among the wheat, Matth. xiii. 25.

LANGII, OP.:—The wars of the world are nothing but outbreaks of the evil heart, in which the evil lusts fight against God, against man and also among themselves, Ps. cxl. 3.

CRAMER:—Many a man rakes and scrapes and strives to get everything for his own use to no purpose, and labours tooth and nail but only hinders himself therewith.

QUESNEL:—It is a great mercy of God not to hear men if they offer unjust prayers, Ps. lxvi. 18.

STIER:—It is natural that the heathen, before Christ teaches them peace, break the battle-bow (Zech. ix. 10) and live fighting and warring with one another; but where Christendom knows and confesses the name of God, peace ought surely to be there. To be sure, this so-called Christendom upon earth, inclosing (not contrary to the Divine purpose) as a net many nations, is far from being the Church of Saints, the Body of the Lord, animated and occupied by His Spirit; hence to this day bloody wars are waged even between Christian nations, and it cannot be otherwise because of righteousness against unrighteousness; the vigorous conduct of such wars is the Christian duty of rulers and ruled (kings and subjects) in the right place to which the sword put by God into hands [of lawful authority—M.] belongs. Moreover the good fight of faith must go on among Christian nations, states and churches, the sword of the spirit must be drawn against whatever is unchristian and ungodly, just as every holy man must fight for peace with the devil and with the world. But James makes no reference whatever to this good fight; he doubtless includes pure zeal for the truth in love, directed against all unrighteousness and whatever belong thereto in word or deed, in the peace in which the fruit of righteousness should be sown (ch. iii. 18). But for all, enough remains for this cutting question: "Whence are wars and whence are fightings among you, quarrelling and discord in word and deed among brethren and members of the Church of God, evil wars on a small scale like those without among the nations?"

JAKOBI:—Do not even desire that which cannot benefit thee in things pertaining to God, and whatever thou dost desire, desire it only in as far as it furthers thy eternal salvation. But if thou prayest only in order to have and to enjoy, if thou openest communication with God only in order to receive or as it were to extort from Him worldly gifts, thou dost indeed draw nigh to Him with thy mouth and serve Him with thy lips, but thy heart is far from Him.

NEANDER:—James like Paul here presupposes an inward conflict in man, the conflict between flesh and spirit. As Paul calls the powers of evil the law in the members, because the body is the outward manifestation of man and because the dominion of sinful desires exhibits itself on and in the body, so James speaks of the lusts that war in the members.

VIEDEBANDT:—The real trouble-states (*Störenfriede*=disturbers of peace) in the world are seated deep in the hearts of men—the worldly lusts.—Peace *among* men is the consequence of peace *in* men.—Who carries his point among men by quarrelling, is always the loser no matter how much he may gain besides, for he loses with God.—There is relatively little praying in the world and besides, much of that little is evil praying.—Most men desire the gifts of God, not God Himself.—Envy seeks quarrel and quarrel brings woe.—We find often many obstacles in the way by our desires. Why? Because self-will and pride present obstacles to Divine help.

LISCO:—The sinful lusts.—The dissensions of worldly life.—The nature and consequence of lusts.

PORUBSZKY:—The deepest root of all strife.

[v. 1. Harmony ought to reign in the members (ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν. The word μέλος signifies 1. a limb, a member; 2. a song and then the music to which a song is set, an air, a tune, a melody. ἐν μέλει, in tune, harmoniously. The Greek word μέλος would suggest the double idea of member and harmony to a Greek ear and I cannot but consider the selection of the word to have contemplated such an allusion), but now they exhibit strife and discord, the confusion of the camp and the violence of an armed soldiery. The lusts act the part of soldiers (στρατευομένων), they are not only encamped within us and foraging (Alford), but they are acting the part of soldiers, engaging in all the offices of military service.—M.].

[v. 2. φονεύετε. This was especially true of those bands of λῃσταί, *sicarii*, robbers and assassins, who, under the name of *zealots*, infested Jewish society at this time, and at last made the Temple itself a den of assassins. See Matth. xxi. 13. Evidences of the blood-thirsty spirit of rage, which now like a fiend possessed the heart of large numbers of the people, may be seen in the murderous plots and violent and frequent

outbreaks at this period, mentioned in Josephus (see below), and in the Gospel and Acts, such as that of Barabbas (Matth. xxvii. 16; Jno. xviii. 40), and of Judas of Galilee, and Theudas (Acts v. 36), and the Egyptian (Acts xxi. 38), and the conspiracy against St. Paul (Acts xxiii. 12–14). There may also be a reference here to the cry of the multitude assembled from all parts of the Jewish dispersions at the Passover, "*Crucify Him*" (Matth. xv. 13, 14). Wordsworth.—M.].

[WHITBY cites the following passages from Josephus. *Bell. Jud.* IV. 10; II. 1; *Antiq.* XVIII. 1; *Bell. Jud.* II. 28; VII. 31; I. 705.—M.].

VIII. SIXTH ADMONITION.

EXHORTATION TO REPENTANCE ADDRESSED TO THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS AND THE JEWS IN REFERENCE TO THEIR BEING ON THE WAY TO APOSTASY. THEY ARE ADDRESSED AS (RELIGIOUS) ADULTERERS AND ADULTERESSES, AS APOSTATES. THEIR FRIENDSHIP OF THE WORLD, WHICH IS THE CAUSE OF THEIR IMPENDING APOSTASY, THEY WERE TO ACKNOWLEDGE AS ENMITY OF GOD, TO REPENT OF IT AND TO RETURN FROM THEIR WORLDLY RUNNING AND WANDERING TO THE QUIETNESS OF A CONDUCT MARKED BY HUMILITY AND RESIGNATION TO THE DIVINE WILL.

CHAPTER IV. 4–17.

4 Ye adulterers[1] and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world[2] is
enmity with God[3] whosoever[4] therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy[5] of
5 God. Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain,[6] The spirit that dwelleth in us
6 lusteth to envy? But he giveth more grace. Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the
7 proud, but giveth grace unto the humble. Submit yourselves therefore to God.
8 Resist[7] the devil, and he will flee from you. Draw nigh to God, and he will draw
nigh to you. Cleanse *your* hands, *ye* sinners; and purify *your* hearts, *ye* double-
9 minded. Be afflicted, and mourn, and[8] weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning,
10 and *your* joy to heaviness. Humble yourselves in the sight of the[9] Lord, and he shall
11 lift you up. Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his
brother, and[10] judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law:
12 but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge. There is one
lawgiver,[11] who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou[12] that judgest another?[13]
13 Go to now, ye that say, To day or[14] to morrow we will go[15] into such a city, and
14 continue[16] there[17] a year,[18] and buy and sell, and get gain: Whereas ye know not
what[19] *shall be* on the morrow. For what *is* your life?[20] It is[21] even a vapour, that
15 appeareth for a little time, and[22] then vanisheth away. For that ye *ought* to say, If
16 the Lord will,[23] we shall live,[24] and do this, or that. But now ye rejoice[25] in your
17 boastings: all[26] such rejoicing is evil. Therefore to him that knoweth to do[27] good,
and doeth *it* not, to him it is sin.

Verse 4. [1] A. B. Sin. etc. Vulg., Bede, Lachmann, Tischendorf and other translations read only μοιχαλίδες. μοιχοί preceding it in G. K. etc. originated probably in the O. T. symbolical sense having been abandoned and the literal sense adopted.
[2] Cod. Sin. inserts τούτου after κόσμου.
[3] Cod. Sin. reads ἔστι τῷ θεῷ for τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν of Rec. and al.
[[4] B. Cod. Sin. read ἐὰν for ἄν.—M.]
[[5] Cod. Sin. has ἐχθρὰ for ἐχθρὸς.—M.]
Lange: Ye [adulterers and] adulteresses know ye not that the friendship of the world is the enmity of God? Whosoever therefore willeth to be a friend of the world, standeth up as an enemy of God.
[Ye adulteresses .... is enmity of God? .... shall be minded (Alford) to be a friend of the world, is constituted an enemy of God.—M.]

Verse 5 [6] A. B. Sin. Lachmann, Wiesinger read κατῴκισεν for κατῴκησεν G. K. etc.
Lange: Or do ye suppose .... The spirit that made His abode in us, as opposed to envy, longeth upward?
[Or do ye fancy .... The spirit that He planted in us, jealously desireth? (So de Wette, and after him Alford).—M.]

Verse 6. Lange: Still greater however [than is the longing], He giveth grace: wherefore it [the Scripture] saith ...
[But He giveth greater grace: wherefore He saith, God is opposed to the proud but giveth grace to the humble.—M.]

Verse 7. [7] A. B. Sin. Vulg. etc. insert δέ after the verb. δέ is omitted probably in order to give to the sentence a more independent form.
Lange: Subject yourselves .... But resist ....
[Submit yourselves .... But resist the devil and he shall flee from you.—M.]

Verse 8. Lange: . . . . Cleanse the hands, ye sinners, and consecrate [make chaste unto God] the hearts, ye double-minded.
[Purify your hands . . . . , and make chaste your hearts.—M.]

Verse 9. [[8] A. and Cod. Sin. omit καὶ before κλαύσατε.—M.]
Lange: Feel miserable and mourn and weep! Let your laughter turn itself into lamentation and your joy into dejectedness.
[Be wretched and mourn and weep: . . . . , and your joy into humiliation.
[Alford: The old English noun *downcast*, now obsolete as a noun, is the exact equivalent of κατήφεια and ought to be resuscitated.—M.]

Verse 10. [[9] Cod. Sin. inserts οὖν after ταπεινώθητε.—M.]
The omission of τοῦ does not affect the translation. [A. B. K. etc. Cod. Sin. omit it.—M.]
Lange: . . . . . before the Lord, and He will exalt you.
[Be humbled, therefore, before . . . . and He shall exalt you.—M.]

Verse 11. [10] A. B. K. Sin. etc. Tischendorf read ἢ κρίνων for καὶ [Rec. etc.—M.]
Lange: Do not calumniate [decry] one another, brethren. He that calumniateth or judgeth his brother, calumniateth the law and judgeth the law.
[Do not speak against one another, brethren; he that speaketh against a brother or judgeth his brother, speaketh against . . . . M.]

Verse 12. [11] καὶ κριτής omitted by Rec. [with K. L. etc.—M.], is inserted in A. B., many minuscules, almost all the versions, Tischend. Lachm. also Cod. Sin.
[[12] A. B. K. L. many minusc. Cod. Sin. Vulg. Syr. Copt. al. insert δὲ after σύ, a reading by all means to be retained on account of the strong emphasis "But *thou* (almost contemptuous), who *art* thou?"—M.]
[13] A. B. Cod. Sin. and many minuscules fix the readings ὁ κρίνων and τὸν πλησίον against those of Rec. ὃς κρίνεις, and τὸν ἕτερον.
[K. adds (see Ps. xxxvi. 23) ὅτι οὐκ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀλλ' ἐν θεῷ τὰ διαβήματα ἀνθρώπου κατευθύνεται—M.]
Lange: One is the Lawgiver and Judge, He, who is able . . . . . .But who art thou, thou that judgest [art judging] thy neighbour? [. . . . But thou. who art thou that judgest thy neighbour?—M.]

Verse 13. [14] A. G. I. etc. Tischendorf [Cod. Sin. Alford.—M.] read σήμερον καὶ αὔριον, which is also more authentic and important than ἢ αὔριον.
[15] Lachmann and Tischendorf following B. etc., several minusc. Vulg., read the Future for the Subjuntive of Rec. In point of matter more suitable. A. has first two Subjunctives then two Indicates. [So Cod. Sin.—M.]
[[16] A. B. Alford ἐμπορευσόμεθα καὶ κερδήσομεν. K. L. Subjunctive.—M.]
[[17] A. omits ἐκεῖ.—M.]
[18] B. and Lachmann omit ἕνα, but the omission is not decisive.
Lange: Well then, ye that say: to-day and to-morrow we will journey to such and such a city, and will work there one year, and do business and make gain.
[Go to now . . . . to-day and to-morrow we will set forth to this city and will spend there one year and will traffic [de Wette, Van Ess, Allioli etc. Alford] and get gain.—M.]

Verse 14. [19] The Plural τὰ (A. Lachmann) is in every case more telling than τὸ (G. I.) Tischendorf.
[20] Lachmann, following A. Vulg. etc. omits γὰρ after ἀτμίς, which makes the expression more difficult, but also more lively. [But A. Cod. Sin. Vulg. Copt. omit not only γὰρ but ἀτμὶς γάρ.—M.]
[21] ἐστε is fixed by A. B. I. etc.
[22] A. B. etc. read καὶ for δέ [Rec. Vulg. Æth. Bede put καὶ before ἔπειτα· Cod. Sin. agrees with A. ἔπειτα καὶ is accordingly the most authentic reading.—M.]
Lange: Yes ye that know not [understand not] what will be to-morrow [the great tempests of judgment]. For what [of what kind] is your life? A vapour, forsooth, ye are, which appeareth for a little while, and then vanisheth [again].
[Whereas ye know not the things of to-morrow: for of what sort (Alford) is your life? For ye are a vapour which appeareth for a little while, then vanishing as it came.—M.]

Verse 15. [23] [B. reads θέλῃ.—M.]
[24] A. B. Cod. Sin. read ζήσομεν and ποιήσομεν. So Lachmann, Tischendorf [and Alford. K. L. al. have the Subjunctive.—M.]
Lange: Instead of that you ought to say . . . .
[Instead of which ye . . . . we shall both live and do this or that.—M.]

Verse 16. [[25] Cod. Sin. has κατακαυχᾶσθε for καυχᾶσθε.—M.]
[[26] Cod. Sin. has ἅπασα for πᾶσα—M.]
Lange: But now ye boast yourselves in your [vain] illusions, all boasting of such kind is evil.
[But now ye glory in your vain-boastings: all such glorying is wicked.—M.]

Verse 17. [[27] (A.) reads ποιῆσαι for ποιεῖν.—M.]
Lange: To him now who knoweth . . . . , to him it will turn to sin.
[So that to him who . . . . , to him it is sin.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Analysis:—Reproach of the impending apostasy, v. 4.—Exhortation to a better and higher aim, vv. 5, 6.—The characteristics of their conversion to God on theocratic fundamental ideas (the new allegiance of the people of God, their purification, penitential mourning, and humiliation according to their situation) vv. 7-10.—Renovation of their conduct towards the brethren, vv. 11, 12.—Dissuasion from their restless, gain-seeking and self-willed wandering through the world in consideration of the approaching storm of judgment vv. 13–15.—Reproof of their false security and forewarning of their conscience. vv.16,17.

Reproach of the impending apostasy.

Ver. 4. **Ye adulteresses, know ye not.**—The fact, that the majority of commentators are in favour of the Text. Rec., the authorities to the contrary notwithstanding, and that they consequently read; "ye adulterers and adulteresses," is rightly accounted for by Huther, who says that it arises from their taking the term in a literal sense, "which is expressly done by Augusti, Lachmann and Winer." But we can hardly conceive any thing more extravagant than to suppose that James would brand all Jewish Christians as literal adulterers and adulteresses. It is however in perfect keeping with the symbolical language of the Old Testament that James here describes the Judaistic bias to apostasy from the living God of revelation, Ps. lxxiii. 27; Is. lvii. 3; Ez. xxiii. 27; Hosea; Matth. xii. 39; xvi. 4; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Rev. ii. 22. The wonder is that this passage has not led commentators to learn the symbolical character of the whole Epistle, and more particularly the symbolical character of the rich in ch. ii and ch. v. The only suprising part of this exposition is the occurrence of the feminine *adulteresses*, a term which Theile considers to be not altogether

fitting, which Wiesinger calls singular as applied to individuals, while Huther remarks that the term should be referred to Churches. Besides it is noteworthy that symbolical adultery according to the usage of the Old Testament and according to the figure itself is feminine inasmuch as it describes the apostasy of the Lord's bride. To this must be added that the Apostle is not addressing now the Jewish Christian Churches in particular, but Judaism in general, such as, in the preceding section, he saw it sundered into the most diverse factions. The Plural probably denotes this disruption, not only the several synagogues but also the several factions.

Know ye not.—From your theocratical calling to the covenant with God as opposed to the ungodly world, and from your teaching and knowledge.

That the friendship of the world.—That is befriending and alliance with an ungodly world (ch. i. 27; cf. 1 Jno. ii. 15), not merely inclination to wordly goods (Theile and al.), nor worldly desires (Laurentius), nor both of these together (de Wette). The world is personified in this antithesis; it is idolatry depicted as a whole, the vanity of mankind deifying itself and deified (*i. e.*, ungodliness showing itself in its propensity for the impersonal) connected with the whole visible world frustrated by it. The Judaistic friendship for the world, which must be taken chiefly in an active sense, consisted just in the chiliastic desire of enjoying a worldly glory which at the best was only dyed hierarchically pious (in sensual enjoyment, honour and dominion cf. Matth. iv.). It is to be noticed that this vain worldliness concealed itself under the garb of a pious fleeing from the world (the hatred of heathenism, even of Gentile-christian, pretended uncleanness).

Is enmity of God.—Here also the predominant active sense must be held fast "on which account the majority of commentators interpret it straightway by ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν (Rom. viii. 7)" Huther. Lachmann following the *inimica* of the Vulgate, has even adopted the reading ἐχθρὰ [which, however, is also the reading of the Cod. Sin.—M.], which greatly weakens the weight of the idea.

Whoever therefore shall be minded to be a friend of the world.—Inference drawn from what precedes. Ὃς βουληθῇ. The difficulty which has been found in this expression, because it seems to involve an intentional choice of evil, is set aside if we distinguish between a formal and a material intention. The Apostle certainly could not suppose his readers to have the formal intention of surrendering to the world. But it was very different with the material intention of taking a direction in worldliness which involved the friendship of the world. But this was precisely the case with the rebellious chiliasm of the Jews, even with the worldly-mindedness of Judaistic Christians. And in this sense the term certainly lays stress both on the conscious intention (Baumgarten) and on the antithesis of their doing which had already become a reality. Whosoever is devoted to the world, although as yet only in his heart (not, as Wiesinger, who for the present is only inclined that way), has stood up as the enemy of God, because our attitude to God is determined by the attitude of our heart. The Lord looketh at the heart. Huther's laying stress on the construction that the world must be taken here as an aggregate of persons, because φιλία then consists in a reciprocity, seems to be an expedient beside the mark. That the world is represented as an aggregate of persons stands to reason; but the question is whether the persons are to be honoured as persons or dishonoured as impersonal things as a means of selfishness. However he rightly observes that καθίσταται here as in ch. iii. 6, must not be weakened, but denotes "he takes the attitude." We render "he stands up," or "appears," because this brings out the as yet inward character of his attitude. [On the whole "is constituted" seems to be the best rendering of the term in English; it does not touch the inward or the outward attitude in particular but involves either and this seems really to be the Apostle's meaning. It is immaterial whether the man's purpose be latent, uttered in words or manifest in deeds, in any case he is constituted an enemy of God.—M.].

Exhortation to a better and higher aim, vv. 5, 6.

Ver. 5. **Or do ye fancy that the Scripture saith in vain.**—This passage is one of the most difficult in the New Testament; we must therefore refer the reader to the Commentaries for a full discussion of the question (see Schneckenburger, *Beiträge*, p. 193: Huther, Wiesinger, etc.). We have first to set aside the really desperate expositions which aim at improving the text (see Huther's note p. 166) and then the connection of πρὸς φθόνον with what goes before. The Scripture saith against envy (du Mont), or: Think ye that the Scripture speaks in vain and *enviously* (πρὸς φθόνον adverbially, Gebser)? But in that case πρὸς φθόνον ought to precede λέγει. We consider the exposition of Beza, Grotius and al.: "The spirit of man has a natural bias to envy" as underrated by Huther. In that case the words have to be connected with what the Scripture says of the envy of Cain, and similar passages. But that exposition is inadmissible, for 1. The spirit is described as having taken up its abode in us and consequently distinguished from ourselves, 2. μείζονα κ. τ. λ. would be without a subject. The first difficulty, indeed, would be obviated if we could take πνεῦμα in the sense of πνεῦμα φθόνου according to Wisd. 2, 24.= διάβολος. Huther undervalues the similar exposition of Semler ad. v. 7, saying, "because of its strangeness we make room for Semler's note on this passage: *Jacobus, Paulus, Petrus, Judas uno quasi ore id confirmant, opus esse, ut Romanis et sic (!) Deo se subjiciant*" and further on: "*τῷ διαβόλῳ, qui per πνεῦμα φθόνου vos suscitat adversus magistratum romanum.*" But the want of a subject to μείζονα deters us from adopting this exposition somewhat as follows: even the Holy Scripture testifies that there has come among us a spirit which excites that envy which is the specific attribute of that love of the world which causes the wars and fightings described above (see the book of Jonah). Less tenable is the exposition which makes the spirit to denote the Divine Spirit but takes the respective words interrogatively, as follows, "*num ad invidiam proclivis est Spiritus Sanctus? minime*" (so Gabler and simi-

larly Bede, Calvin and al.). Where the citation from Holy Writ introduces the subject, we hardly expect an interrogative sentence. The interpretation of de Wette, Huther and al. is at present urged more than any other. Huther: "Or do ye think that the Scripture speaks in vain? (No) the Spirit, that has taken His abode in us, enviously desires us, but gives (so much the) more grace; therefore He saith," etc.—The parentheses abundantly show how very forced is this interpretation, which is also advocated by Schneckenburger and al. Our objections to it are as follows: 1. The anthropomorphism "that the Spirit of God loves us even unto envy" is too strong. The reference to ζῆλος, the jealousy of God in the conjugal relation He sustains to His people, is allowable but ζῆλος is not φθόνος, which is uniformly mentioned in Holy Scripture as a source of evil. To this must be added 2. The postulated supplements and the defective antithesis "but He gives so much the more grace," etc. But this mode of expression at first sight grows even more dark, if we understand with Wiesinger τὸ πνεῦμα as the object of the human spirit, supplying ὁ θεός as the subject: Divine Love enviously desires the object of its Love, that is, the human spirit from God (*i. e.*, aus Gott=emanating from God—M.], which turns either to God or to the world. If we bear in mind that θεός had been named immediately before, the envious loving remains in the first place, and then appears as a loving which is only directed to the Spirit. This applies also to the similar interpretation of Theile, who supplies however ἡ γραφή instead of ὁ θεός. However, even if we wished to retain the interpretation of Wiesinger or Huther we should be obliged to go back to the passage Ex. xx. 5. The jealousy of God would be expressed in His visiting the iniquity of idolatry (=adultery) on the children of the third and fourth generation, and the antithesis "but showing mercy unto thousands, etc.," would be adequately expressed in μείζονα δὲ δίδωσι χάριν. With reference to the citation in question, we have the following conjectures which we give in brief from Huther: Gen. vi. 3, 5 (Grotius), Gen. viii. 21 (Erasmus, Beza, etc.), Numb. xi. 29 (Witsius), Deut. v. 9 (Schneckenburger), Deut. xxxii. 21 (Heisen), Ps. cxix. 20 (Clericus), Prov. xxi. 10 (Michaelis), Song of Solomon viii. 6 (Coccejus), Wisdom of Sol. vi. 12 (Wettstein). Others again have guessed at passages from the New Testament, at some lost passage in the prophets, at a passage in the Apocryphal book called the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs or at a collective statement of different passages of Holy Scripture. Huther denies the fact of a citation altogether and believes the reference to be to a statement of James and that ἡ γραφὴ λέγει adverts either to the idea immediately preceding or to the citation introduced with διὸ λέγει in v. 6: ὁ θεός, etc. After all the interpretations given, that of Luther (Gomarus, Bengel and al.) still continues to possess much weight, viz., "the spirit lusteth against hatred=invidia," (cf. Gal. v. 17); in favour of which may be produced the following passages: Ps. xxxvii. 1, etc.; v. 34, etc.; Ps. lxxiii. 3, etc. Huther can hardly dispute successfully that πρὸς φθόνον in point of language may be equivalent to κατὰ φθόνον and that ἐπιποθεῖν may be taken in the sense of ἐπιθυμεῖν. But we still want the subject for μείζονα δὲ κ. τ. λ. and we are driven to recognize it in πνεῦμα itself. Then it is the Divine Spirit in believers on the one hand, mediating in them a longing going beyond the love of the world (Rom. viii. 23–26), and on the other also a grace which is beyond all longing, praying and understanding (1 Cor. ii. 9; Eph. iii. 22). We therefore construe the passage with reference to Ps. xxxvii. 1 and Ps. lxxiii. 3 as follows: "over against and opposed to envy (which is really at the bottom of your worldliness and is the very soul of your wars, fightings and insurrections) the Spirit who took abode among us, utters a higher longing (ἐπιποθεῖ emphatic), and not in vain; for the self-same Spirit mediates also the grace which goes even beyond our longing in Him." The Jews in consequence of the envy of their worldliness became unbelieving with respect to Christianity (Acts xiii. 45; ch. xxii. 22), and rebellious toward the Romans; but the spirit which lived and acted in the true theocrats from Abel to Asaph (Ps. lxxiii.) and from him and the prophets to the Christians, coming in contact with it [envy?—M.] was longing beyond it and its objects for the immortal. And as envy shows itself in the proud whom God opposes, so that longing shows itself in the humble to whom He gives grace. We therefore give our sense of this passage by way of paraphrase. The friendship of the world of which envy is really the soul, and the friendship of God, of which the longing of the Spirit is really the soul are incompatibles and inimically opposed to each other. This may be proved from Scripture. For as to our relation to God it says not without reason that the strong longing of the Divine Spirit, who took up His abode in us (who united with our spirit, is the spirit of prayer, of our yearning for heavenly riches; while as the Spirit of Divine consolation and peace He mediates for us a grace which is even greater than our longing), bids defiance to and is opposed to envy which is the truest form of the spirit of the world. But as to the relation of God to ourselves, the Scripture saith: God resists the haughty and proud who are at one with the spirit of envy, while He gives grace to the humble whó are at one with the poor in spirit. On the meaning of πρός=in *relation* or in *proportion to*, or *against*, in *opposition to* cf. the Lexica. The sentence, more clearly defined, would read thus: πρὸς τὸ ποθεῖν τοῦ φθόνου ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα.—The Comparative "greater (more) grace" must consequently not be referred to the antithesis: what the friendship of the world does give (Bede, Gebser and al.), or: "*eo majorem, quo longius recesseris ab invidia*" (Bengel), or according to an obscure thought: as compared with the case that the πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖν did not take place (Wiesinger, de Wette, Huther).

[Without reconsidering this bewildering conflict of opinions, the view which seems to harmonize best with the context and the line of James' argument, is to take πνεῦμα as the *object*, and understanding the Holy Spirit, to supply ὁ Θεός as the *subject* and to render πρὸς φθόνον adverbially. "The (Holy) Spirit that He (God) planted in us,

jealously desireth [us]." The expression is highly figurative and alludes to the conjugal relation between God and the soul of believers. The Spirit of God implanted in us, jealously desireth us, jealously desires us to break entirely with the world and to be wholly consecrated and devoted to God. Any temporizing with the world would be spiritual adultery.—Then as to the citation from Scripture referred to we hold with many commentators that James gives the general sense of Scripture without specifying a particular passage. Alford takes the same view. —M.].

VER. 6. This greater grace is the greater measure of the comforting and satisfying Spirit as related to the longing Spirit. *διὸ λέγει*, that is the same Scripture, not *τὸ πνεῦμα*. [But why not refer *διὸ λέγει* to *τὸ πνεῦμα* the Holy Spirit? He speaks in us and in the Holy Scriptures—M.]. *διὸ* is very apposite: just as the Scripture speaks of our relation to God, so it speaks of God's relation to us. The passage in question is Prov. iii. 34 LXX., which has however *ὁ κύριος* instead of *ὁ Θεός*. [The same variation occurs in 1 Pet. v. 5.—M.]. *Ὑπερήφανοι* (not exactly equivalent to the idea *τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες* in Rom. xii. 16) are the same as the rich in ch. v. 1 etc. or in the Sermon on the Mount, Luke vi. 24 etc. In like manner the *ταπεινοί* represent the poor, the lowly, the wretched in a symbolical sense, so much comforted in the Old Testament, or the poor in spirit, the suffering, the meek and the merciful of the Sermon on the Mount.

The characteristics of conversion to God required of the readers of the Epistle, or theocratic fundamental ideas.—The new allegiance of the people of God. Their approach, purification, penitential mourning and humiliation according to their situation. vv. 7–10.

VER. 7. **Subject yourselves therefore to God.**—Now follows a series of theocratic ideas in the process of the New Testament fulfilment or completion, which significantly reflect in consecutive order the several moments of Jewish conversion; a circumstance which seems to be not sufficiently noticed by Exegesis. *Subject* yourselves to God; become once more His real subjects, as the people of God, in opposition to your leaning to apostasy. This is the first and the whole, an exhortation not exclusively addressed to the decided *ὑπερήφανοι*. Calvin emphasizes the circumstance that the reference is not to obedience to God in general, but to *submissio* in particular. Semler indeed maintained that they were exhorted "*ut Romanis se subjiciant, et sic Deo*," but it is rather the reverse; they were first to subject themselves to God and then in consequence of it, to the power appointed to rule them. Their submission to the rule of the living God was moreover to exhibit itself in their humbly getting reconciled to the new order of things, the change of Judaism into Christianity, the unity of Jews and Gentiles in Christianity and the existing rule of pagan Rome.

But resist the devil.—Not only because he is the enemy of God and the prince of this world, by the attractions of which they suffer themselves to be enticed, but especially because he is the demon of self-boasting and envy, who assumes the garb of an angel of light, and desires them by representing that his temptation to sedition is a call from God, ch. i. 13.—Being only half-decided and doubting make the tempter bold and strong, while resolute courage in God and resistance unmask him in his impotence; for real courage and real power come from God; the power of Satan is a lying phantom-power (Matth. iv.). It is only in the self-temptation of man that the temptation of Satan can become efficient. [Huther quotes Hermas, *Pastor*, 2, 12.—"*δύναται ὁ διάβολος παλαῖσαι, καταπαλαῖσαι δὲ οὐ δύναται, ἐὰν οὖν ἀντίστῃς αὐτόν, νικηθεὶς φεύξεται ἀπὸ σοῦ κατῃσχυμμένος.*"—M.].

Draw nigh to God.—The allegiance of the people of God is followed by their drawing near to Him. נָגַשׁ or קָרַב in relation to God is a specifically theocratical idea. Ex. xx. 21; xxiv. 2; Lev. xvi. 1; Ezek. xl. 46; cf. Is. xxix. 13; Heb. vii. 19; hence the expression *Korban*, that which is consecrated or offered to God. Here drawing near is used in the N. T. real sense=convert yourselves. The particular although not the exclusive reference to prayer.

And He will draw nigh to you.—The antithesis "Resist the devil and he shall flee from you" corresponds to the antithesis "Draw nigh to God and He will draw nigh to you." (See 2 Chron. xv. 2; Is. lvii. 15; Zech. i. 3).

VER. 8. **Cleanse the hands, ye sinners.**—The first specifically theocratic act. The expression refers to the Levitical purifications, the negative part of Levitical repentance, separateness from the world. The prophets did already apply this symbolical purification to ethical purification or rather interpret it ethically according to its profound import. See Is. i. 15, 16; Ps. xviii. 21; xxiv. 4; "He that hath clean hands and a pure heart." The hands are the organ and symbol of ethical actions. To cleanse the hands signifies therefore to repent (Pott), to become separate from evil works, especially from lovelessness and wrong. This summons does not begin the summons to conversion (Huther), for it is already implied in the words "Subject yourselves to God," which branch out into two moments, the negative "to resist the devil," and the positive "to draw nigh to God." This approach to God, in its turn, branches out into purification and sanctification in the narrow sense.

Consecrate your hearts.—The real consecration of our life to God consists in the consecration of the heart, in its surrender to God (Ps li. 12, 18, 19; Prov. xxiii. 26; Jer. xxxi. 33; 1 Pet. iii. 15 etc.). The words "ye sinners" relate to the cleansing of the hands, the words "ye double-minded" to the consecration of the heart. The term *ἁγνίσατε* probably alludes more particularly to the unchastity of the heart, as the source of religious adultery. Wavering and unchastity are here alike, so are on the other hand simplicity or decision and chastity.—They are *sinners* in a particular sense according to theocratic ideas, as far as they are about to excommunicate themselves by their evil actions (ch. ii. 3), to burden themselves with the ban of the real congregation of God (publicans and sinners=those who are liable to the discipline of the synagogue); but the reason lies in this double-mindedness, their wavering (ch. i. 7, 8), their mischievous halting between God and the

world, between Christianity and apostasy. Calvin's note is almost superfluous: "*non duo hominum genera designat, sed eosdem vocat peccatores et duplices animo.*" It is evident from vv. 6 and 8 that this exhortation to their own self-activity presupposes the grace of God as the source of strength.

Ver. 9. **Feel miserable and mourn.**—Hardly limited to the mourning which introduces and accompanies the repentance of individuals; the type is found in the Old Testament extraordinary acts of penitence which in situations of uncommon offences and peril were performed to complete the ordinary acts of penitence, viz. purifications and consecrations or offerings, Ex. xxxiii. 4; Judg. ii. 4; Ch. xxi. 2; 1 Sam. vii. 6 etc.—The verb ταλαιπωρεῖν (ἅπαξ λεγ. in N. T.; the adjective form in Rom. vii. 24; Rev. iii. 17; the noun Rom. iii. 16; Jas. v. 1), denotes primarily to go outwardly through hard work, to endure hardship or distress, then the inward sense of misery on account of outward or inward wretchedness. Grotius and Roman Catholic theologians apply it without reason to castigations. Jewish fasting and other castigations as symbols of penitential sorrow are indeed the type, but Christian penitential sorrow must not be changed back into legal symbolism.

Mourn and weep.—See Neh. viii. 9; Mark xvi. 10; Luke vi. 25; Rev. xviii. 15, 19. The putting on of mourning-apparel or sitting in sackcloth and ashes (Grotius) can only be the type of the Gospel requirement of inward mourning (2 Cor. vii. 10).

Let your laughter be turned.—Is. lxv. 13; Luke vi. 25. "James passes from the outward manifestation (γέλως-πένθος) to the inward state (χαρά—κατήφεια)." Huther.—κατήφεια, casting down of the eyes, literally and figuratively. Hence shame and humiliation, ἅπαξ λεγ., Luke xviii. 13.

Ver. 10. **Humble yourselves before the Lord.**—The fundamental idea of the leadings of the Old Testament and the O. T. fundamental rule of piety and of the promises attached to it; it has met its fulfilment in the humiliation and exaltation of Christ and must be realized in the life of believers (Rom. vi. 4; Job v. 11; Ezek. xxi. 26; Matth. xxiii. 12; Luke xiv. 11; 1 Pet. v. 6; cf. Sir. ii. 17). As this humbling must be realized inwardly in the bowing of repentance before God (ἐνώπιον κυρίου), and outwardly in the patient enduring of the humiliating state of servitude and lowliness (ὑπὸ τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, i. Pet. v. 6) appointed by Him, so the exaltation also should begin with the inward consciousness of the exaltation, liberty and glory of the Divine Sonship [*i. e.* the state of being the children of God in Christ=*Gotteskindschaft*; υἱοθεσία, adoption—M.] and come to its outward consummation in the future glory, of which we have however some antepast here on earth. κύριος does not exactly signify Christ (Grotius), nor θεός as opposed to Christ (Huther and al.). James wants to see the living God of revelation recognized in Christ.

Renovation of their conduct towards the brethren. vv. 11, 12.

Ver. 11. **Do not calumniate one another, brethren.**—Huther thinks that this exhortation, couched in a milder form than the preceding and exhibiting a contrast in the address, ἀδελφοί being opposed to μοιχαλίδες, ἁμαρτωλοί δίψυχοι, intimates that James now addresses, at least primarily, another class of persons, namely those "who by the worldly ways of the former felt induced to do those things against which he exhorts them." But Wiesinger takes a more correct view as the transition: "The connection is as follows: if they thus humble themselves before God, they must not deny humility in the judgment they pass on their brethren. He therefore exhorts them to put away imaginary superiority to others in judging them, which is really an arrogant usurping of the judicial functions of God. The end corresponds to the beginning. Worldly pride the source of strife, humble submission to God the end thereof." He adds however "he refers particularly to the oppressed." But really there is no reason to see here already a distinct transition from one class to another. Slander and judging were the very soul of their fanatical doings in relation to their brethren. In ch. iii. 1 also he addresses the brethren, although the sequel contains the severest kind of reprimand. καταλαλεῖν found here and 1 Pet. ii. 12; iii. 16. It denotes not only slandering (backbiting, Luther) but also evil contradiction, retorting.—

He that calumniateth or judgeth his brother.—The Participles καταλαλῶν and κρίνων are stronger than the indicative: he, whose characteristic consists in that he calumniates his brother. Huther thinks that while καταλαλεῖν always includes κρίνειν=to condemn, the reverse holds not good. This would make the former the stronger expression, but we consider the latter to be so. κρίνειν passes from a loveless and therefore from a hateful *judging* of one's neighbour to a similar *condemnation* of him. Wiesinger says indeed that "the context affords not the slightest occasion to think here of quarrels among Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians," but the spirit of the whole Epistle constrains us to think of it, although the word ἀλλήλων shows that the primary reference here is to the internal divisions of Judaism. James probably alludes more particularly to the expressions and accusations which the Jews as Judaists and unfree Jewish Christians were wont to bring against the believing and more believing Jews. This seems to follow from the sequel "He that calumniateth, etc., calumniateth the law." Schneckenburger rightly observes that the epithet brother given to the slandered persons emphasizes the peculiarly reprehensible character of calumny. But the sequel shows that the Apostle, by the use of this word, still aims at something more. Νόμος designates here, as in ch. i. 25 and ii. 9, etc., the Old Testament law in its New Testament fulfilment. Hence the idea of Huther is right that slandering and condemning one's brother is really slandering and condemning the law itself, viewed as the law of the Christian life and more particularly as the law of love, for such conduct amounts to rejecting it as an unjust law; but the Apostle's idea seems to be more comprehensive, viz., the condemnation of one's brother from the standpoint of fanatical motives is a condemnation of

the essential νόμος according to its inmost evangelical import and especially as to its tendency of saving and not condemning. Thus the condemnation of one's brother in all cases is not only *without* the law and *contrary* to the law, but it falls also upon the law itself. This was perfectly clear in the case where the Jews judged the Christians; they judged the whole revelation (Jno. v. 45, 46); but in the opposite case also, *i. e.*, that is where Christians judged the Jews, judgment was passed on the heart-point of the law, viz.: the promise of grace. De Wette, who sees in the respective expression only a figurative, pointed speech indicating the disregard of the law, dilutes the idea. Surely Grotius, Baumgarten, Hottinger are not altogether wrong (as Huther thinks) in understanding νόμος as the Christian doctrine and perceiving here the idea that whosoever burdens his neighbour with arbitrary commandments, pronounces upon the deficiency of the Christian doctrine and in so far sets himself up as its judge. For this is just the manner of those who condemn; occupying a false standpoint, in particular that of illiberal legalism, they set themselves up as judges over the word of revelation, which judges no man uncharitably and is unwilling that any man should be absolutely condemned and least of all he, who has taken his standpoint in that very word.

But if thou judgest the law, *i. e.*, if thou settest thyself up condemningly over it.

Thou art not a doer of the law.—Although thou boastest, to be zealous and jealous of it to the highest degree.

But a judge.—The question is does this mean 1, a judge who from another standpoint judges and condemns the law itself, that is a God-hostile adversary of the law, an out and out *anomist* [ἄνομος, without law, a lawless man.—M.], which would require us to supply the Genitive νόμου after κριτής (so Neander, Wiesinger and al.), or 2, does κριτής denote absolutely the judge who administers the law in judging men? This interpretation is opposed by Huther to the former, with the remark that the former makes this sentence and the one preceding it tautological, that it dilutes the antithesis of doer and judge and that the sequel adverts not to a judging of the law but to a judging of men. As to tautology, it does not belong to the first interpretation, because we have then the climax, not doers but condemners of the law. The antithesis "observer and despiser of the law" is surely much stronger than that of "doer and guardian of the law." Lastly the idea "condemner of the law" is substantiated with what goes before. But the relation is such that the *anti-judge* is also always *pseudo-judge* just as *anti-Christ* is also always *Pseudo-Christ.*

VER. 12. **One is the Lawgiver and Judge.**—He is *One*, which is emphatic, not only as contrasted with all men, of whom this is not true, but also in the unity of the Lawgiver and the Judge (Morus), which does not suffer to rise a contradiction between the spirit of the law and the spirit of the judgment such as it ought to exist if the judging of the Judaists were authorized. Now His power to judge has developed itself in the first place as the power to save or to render blessed and in the second as the power to destroy or to damn. The sequel therefore is not a further predicate: "He is able to save, etc." (Luther), but states the characteristic, "He, who is able." This intimates at least that the Judge is the God of the Gospel, who saves or damns men according to their belief or unbelief, Mark xvi. 16.—He manifests Himself in fact as this δυνάμενος and thus establishes His exclusive prerogative to judge. Bengel: *"Nostrum non est judicare, præsertim cum exequi non possimus."*

But who art thou.—*Impotent* before that judicial majesty and power of God, moreover as a sinner guilty of the judgment and in want of grace (see Rom. xiv. 4).

That judgest.—Really who makest judging thy business: ὁ κρίνων, with the Article to which Schneckenburger calls attention. But this word evidently serves to introduce the sequel, according to which a great judgment is impending on these judges.

Dissuasion from their restless, gain-seeking and self-willed wandering through the world in consideration of the approaching storm of judgment. vv. 13–15.

VER. 13. **Well then, ye that say.**—Huther, who is supported by many predecessors (Oecumenius, Bede, Semler, Pott, Hottinger and al.), thinks that James now addresses no longer members of the Christian Church, but the rich; viz., rich Jews, according to the forementioned explanation of the term rich. Gebser and al. contradict this view; Wiesinger holds that James addresses simply a particular class of his readers. But the Apostle's address really avoids every definite outward classification. His Epistle is addressed to the twelve tribes by the hands of the Jewish Christian, *i. e.*, primarily to these with the intent that they should use the Epistle for missionary purposes among their brethren. But as James looks upon Judaism as a solidary* guilt and perverseness attaching to the whole people, although mostly to the unbelieving Jews, so all his exhortations and warnings are addressed through the Jewish Christians to all Jews. Still so that the centre of gravity in his address is continually progressing from the Jewish Christians to the Jews. With respect to this section of the Epistle, while it still describes a gain-loving, trafficking Jewish wandering through the world, of which the Jewish Christians as well as the Jews might readily become guilty, at least to some extent, yet it is evidently the transition to the subsequent prophetical lamentation over the rich, *i. e.*, over the hardened part of the Jewish people, especially their leaders, and is consequently addressed more particulary to the Jews.—The interjection ἄγε νῦν (here and ch. v.; not found elsewhere in the New Testament), according to Theile="age audite," refers doubtless to the announcement of the judgment, which comes out quite clear in ch. v. 1, but is here darkly and menacingly alluded to. James is anxious to communicate to

* Trench says: "*Solidarity*, a word which we owe to the French Communists, and which signifies a community in gain and loss, in honour and dishonour, a being, so to speak, all in the same bottom, is so convenient that it will be in vain to struggle against it."—M.

his readers his sorrowful forebodings of the judgment impending on his people. Grotius renders: "*jam ego ad vos*," de Wette construes it as calling upon them to lay aside the respective fault, Huther as preparing for the κλαύσατε in v. 5.

Ye that say.—οἱ λέγοντες, ye that are in the habit of using such presumptuous and worldly language.

To-day and to-morrow.—See Appar. Crit. καὶ (according to Theile) certainly expresses greater confidence than ἤ; the plan of the journey of the restless traders. Wiesinger understands "*and to-morrow*" of the different plans of journey of different persons, Huther thinks that it fixed the precise duration of the intended journey. But v. 14 shows that "to-morrow" is also added for the purpose of resenting the false security of the project. "To-morrow" denotes therefore the undefined future subsequent to "to-day," not only a second day; for at that time a two days' journey did not take one very far.

We will journey; *we shall journey*, πορευσόμεθα uttered with false, prophetical assurance.

To such and such a city.—A demonstrative pronoun instead of the name of the city, with the collateral idea that the goal is now one city, now another. [I have adopted the rendering *this* city, because "such and such," "this or that" is a sense in which ὅδε is not used; at least the best Lexica do not give it, and I agree with Alford, that Winer p. 174, who refers to Plutarch. *Sympos.* I. 61 for this image of ὅδε = τὸ δεῖνα, does not make his point, and that all that is necessary, is to suppose that τήνδε τὴν πόλιν expresses in general terms the city then present to the mind of the speaker.—M.].

And will work there one year.—ποιεῖν with a definition of time may denote primarily one's stay at a place; but it probably intimates also that the respective time is spent (Acts xv. 33; xx. 3 etc.). But we take the verb "work" in the sense of "working in the conduct of business." The definition *one year* again denotes not only the false security of the calculation, but also their restless, unsteady habits; *then*, they think, *we move on or return.*

And do business [*and traffic*—M.]. The hastily following καὶ and the hastily following future are also pictorial expressions descriptive of their immoderate false security. Bengel: "*Polysyndeton exprimit libidinem animi securi.*" Huther assents to Kern's note: "Traffic is introduced only *by way of example* as characterizing man's doing calculated only with reference to earthly life and as contrasted with the life in God." But it is doubtless an example illustrating the secular aspect of the chief tendency of the Judaism of that time as it already began to develop itself; and the Apostle with a prophet's glance evidently, describes beforehand the fundamental trait of the diabolically excited worldliness of his people, as it afterwards became more and more developed.

VER. 14. **Yes, ye that know not** [*whereas ye know not* E. V. much more correct and idiomatic than Lange's rendering—M.]. οἵτινες, properly, "ye that are of such a kind." [Alford: ="*ut qui*"—"belonging, as ye do, to a class which."—M.].

What will be to-morrow.—Prov. iii. 28, xxvii. 1. The general idea that carnal security is here met by ignorance of the future and the transitoriness of life (Huther) has here also a prophetico-historical bearing. Hence not only: "Ye know not, as mortal men, whether you are still alive to-morrow," but also "ye have no presentiment of what the next future has in reserve for you with our people." It is to be remembered that these words were written by an aged Apostle a few years before that great catastrophe, which brought the greatest misery and death on many thousand people not only at Jerusalem (and James considered Jerusalem and Judea to belong also to the dispersion of the twelve tribes in the enlarged sense of the term), but previously also in many cities of the Roman Empire (Cæsarea, Scythopolis, Ascalon, Damascus, Alexandria; Josephus, *de bello Jud.* 2, 18, 1–8; 20, 2).

For what is your life?—Of what sort, ποία. It is not only fleeting and perishable physically, but as the spiritual life of the nation also it is affected with deadly disease and a deadly destiny.

A vapor, forsooth, ye are.—Better "*For* ye are a vapor."—M.]. On γὰρ see Appar. Crit. The reading ἐστέ is manifestly a stronger expression than ἐστί, applied to their life. "They themselves are thereby described as a vapor, as it is also said of the πλούσιος ch. i. 10 that he shall pass away as the flower of grass." Huther. Does ἀτμίς denote vapor of fire (smoke, as in Acts ii. 19 in connection with καπνοῦ) or vapor of water, that is, a misty formation, or is there no definite reference designed? We feel inclined to take the former view; 1, on account of the familiar reference to Acts ii. 19; Joel iii. 1–5; 2, on account of the reference to fire in ch. v. 3; 3, on account of the greater volatility of the vapor of smoke as compared with the vapor of water which in the shape of cloudy formation is apt to last longer and in reality does not vanish if it dissolves into rain. But the real *tertium comparationis* is certainly the volatility of vapor, presenting an affinity with the volatility of the shadow in Job viii. 9; Ps. cii. 12; cxliv. 4. But in the last passage the figure also contains the idea of a breath and Ps. cii. 4 the figure of smoke. Our passage is probably more nearly related to the one named last.

And then (again).—Laying the emphasis on φαινομένη, appearing in splendid extension, say like an illuminated cloud, καὶ might be rendered *even:* it not only decreases but *even* vanishes. But as objection may be raised to such an emphasis, Huther's explanation of καὶ is sufficient "as it appeared so it vanished." Thus Israel as a nation, was soon to vanish from the rank of nations.

VER. 15. **Instead of that ye ought to say.**—These words connect with v. 13, but the parenthesis v. 14 has the import of a prolonged characterizing address.

If the Lord will, we shall live.—See Appar. Crit. According to the less authenticated reading of the Text Rec. (καὶ ζήσωμεν), adopted by the majority of commentators, καὶ ζήσωμεν is generally connected with the protasis. Luther: "If the Lord will and we live, we shall do this

or that;" Erasmus, Calvin, de Wette. The second *καὶ* then denotes the apodosis. Here the protasis is divided into two hypothetical ideas: if the Lord will and if we live. Grotius and al. take the whole somewhat differently: "if the Lord will *that* we live, then the rest also will follow, then we shall do this or that;" but this really runs into the construction of Luther. Most impracticable is Bornemann's construction, who adopting the *Text Rec.*, makes *καὶ ζήσωμεν* the apodosis in the sense: "let us make our livelihood." The better sense also favours the more critically sustained reading. Not only our doing depends on the will of the Lord, but also, first of all, life itself. Hence if the Lord will, we shall live and then do this or that (Wiesinger, Huther.) [I prefer the reading *ζήσομεν* and render "If the Lord will, we shall both live and shall do this or that," for it is evident that the hypothesis controls both our living and doing. Our life is dependent on the will of God and our doing depends on our living. Cf. Winer, p. 301. —M.].

Reproof of their false security and forewarning of their conscience. vv. 16, 17.

Ver. 16. **But now ye boast yourselves in.**—But now, *i. e.* instead of their thinking and speaking. Instead of it *ye boast yourselves* etc., according to the preliminary allusion, v. 15.

In your illusions.—'Αλαζονεία denotes vaunting or bragging regarded in the light of illusion or deception.—But here we must lay more stress on the objective, vain, arrogant self-exaltation than on the boasting. The clause: "ye boast in your boastings" (de Wette), is rather tautological. Boasting being a joyous testifying of the ground of confidence, the sense is as follows: ye boast in a ground of peace, consisting in those vain illusions or castles in the air, which from their nature are multiform. Huther remarks that *ἐν* denotes not the object but the ground of their boasting; but in this boasting the ground is really made the object.

All boasting of such kind.—That is, grounded on haughtiness and self-illusion; whereas both James and Paul know a holy boasting (ch. i. 9—that is glorying) grounded on the most opposite qualities, not on self-exaltation in forgetfulness of God and departing from God but on self-abasement in reliance on God and resignation to God.

Ver. 17. **To him now who knoweth to do good.**—This is not only a moral sentence used for the purpose of warning the readers but the concluding forewarning addressed to the Judaists, followed by the announcement of the judgments upon those who still persevere in their obduracy; the great turning-point in the Apostle's argument like our Lord's last address to the Jews Jno. xii. 35 (Matth. xxiii.), or that of Paul, Acts xxviii. 23 etc. And first we have to note that the main stress lies not on *καλόν*, as the sum-total of good, because this would require the Article (so Wiesinger), but on *εἰδότι* with which *καλὸν κ. τ. λ.* must be connected. He therefore who, although he knows better, omits the good and *moreover the doing* of good which he knows to do, to him it is reckoned as sin. The reference here, however, is not primarily, that a single sin of omission is also sin, but the whole attitude of an impenitent religious knowledge, the whole self-contradiction of a hypocritical and unfruitful orthodoxism is here described as *a wholesale* sin of omission. As sin, according to Rom. i. 21 began with a great central sin of omission, so it is also sealed with the great, all-embracing sin of omission of impenitence. But this proposition contains also the common doctrine of the single sin of omission. Now concerning this knowledge of good the question arises (according to Huther) whether James refers to the knowledge he had imparted to his readers by his exhortations (Estius), especially by the last (Grotius, de Wette and al.); or whether this knowledge describes one already existing in his readers, as Huther assumes, observing; "the uncertainty of human life is something so palpable that those who notwithstanding talk in their audacity as if it did not exist, as if their life were not dependent on God and contrary to their own knowledge do not that which is seemly but that which is unseemly and therefore is is so much the more sin unto them," We consider this antithesis as confusing. It is surely assumed that the readers of the Epistle knew from the Old Testament the rudiments of doing good and that in this knowledge the Gospel had raised them to the full consciousness of the highest degree of doing good; but it is assumed with equal certainty that this word of the whole Epistle, as a final word of exhortation is to them matter of the greatest and most decisive importance. The word should therefore be taken as a final word with reference to their better knowledge of evangelical behaviour in general and not merely as reminding them of their previous knowledge of their dependence on God. We have still to ask what is sin to one who knows and doeth not? The *knowledge* by itself, or that knowledge as connected with *not doing?* The former would be more piquant and would mean something like this: to such an one even his Jewish prerogatives turn to ruin (Rom. x.). The Gospel proclaimed to him first, becomes to him a savor of death unto death. However we must distinguish sin from the judgment of sin, hence the reference cannot be to the better knowledge by itself but to the contradiction between *knowing* and *not doing*, which runs thrugh the whole Epistle as the object of the Apostle's controversy. This contradiction becomes sin to the perfect *ἀνὴρ δίψυχος* which is reckoned to or reserved for him *i. e.* unto judgment. This great forewarning introduces the subsequent passage of the judgment. It is noteworthy that James seems to foresee with assurance that the greater part or the mass of Israel would grow obdurate contrary to a better knowledge or with an evil consciousness against *doing* the truth of the Gospel and that all the Judaistic corruptions of his Christian readers, which he assails, are also connected with such a conscious perverseness in general and in the whole, although not with reference to every individual in every individual case, and although the solidarity of the judgment is suspended in the case of believing Jews.

[The real point of this saying is hardly brought out in Lange's note and not touched at all under "Doctrinal and Ethical" and "Homiletical and Practical." The reference is not to sins of

omission, but to sinning against light and knowledge, to *doing evil* the knowledge of good notwithstanding. καλόν v. 17 is the opposite of πονηρόν; and the persons, whom James addressed *knew* well enough that they ought to do good, but they separated their knowledge from their practice and *did evil*. This verse (v. 17) contains a sharp rebuke, if not a sarcastic reflection on their inconsistencies.—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. One of the most important life-questions of Christian ethics is undoubtedly that of the Christian's relation to the world which surrounds him. In answering it James again fully agrees with our Lord (cf. Matth. vi. 24), and with Paul the Apostle (cf. Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 29–31; 2 Cor. vi. 14–18). He wants Christians neither to conform to the world nor entirely to separate themselves from it, but he insists so much the more on their being distinguished from the world and on their showing that they are governed by a very different principle and a much loftier spirit than the friends of the world. If this is omitted and on the contrary that friendship of the world is sought, which is incompatible with a harmonious and independent development of the Christian life, it must surely lead to the result, that God and His service are ultimately abandoned. The impossibility of uniting God and the world in the heart of a Christian belongs to the nature of the case; cf. Matth. xii. 30. The world demands that we should love ourselves, God requires us to love Him; the world wants self-exaltation, God abasement and humility. The friend of the world and the friend of God are diametrically opposed to each other in principle, inclination and aim. Moreover how can there exist a lasting communion among things that cannot be reconciled? Here applies the saying in Matth. xvi. 26; Luke x. 38–42.—

2. James as well as the other writers of the New Testament receive the γραφή as the highest authority.

3. No sin is more loathsome in the sight of God than pride. We have only to realize for a moment the light in which a holy God cannot but regard a guilty sinner in order to understand that self-exaltation is not only wicked but almost ridiculous before Him. Thus far we may say that *parcere victis et debellare superbos* is the fundamental law of the Divine government both under the Old Testament and under the New. Then countless examples taken from history prove also the truth of the saying, which is constantly heard in the Gospel. Cf. Matth. xviii. 4; Luke xviii. 14; 1 Pet. v. 5.

4. What James says here (v. 7) of the devil is at once a supplement to his doctrine of the origin of sin (ch. i. 14, 15) and a corrective of those who are wont to dilute the last mentioned passage after the manner of the Pelagians.

5. In writing "Draw near to God and He will draw near to you" James by no means wants to deny that the grace of God is prevenient and free and to teach that the sinner, for his part, must first turn to God, before God is able in grace to turn to him. This would conflict with the nature of the case and also with 1 John iv. 19. But he is here addressing Christians, whom God had already approached before (cf. Is. lxv. 1), but who, by their transgressions, had for a time departed from God and had first to return before they could again enjoy His grace and communion. It is once for all impossible to merit the favour of God by conversion and equally impossible personally to experience it without such a genuine conversion. Now all temporizing [indecision, half-work, German "*Halbtheit*"—M.], all discord between the outward and the inward life is fundamentally incompatible with such a genuine conversion. Cf. Luke xi. 35–41.

6. True joy is the child of sorrow for sin. Man has therefore his choice here on earth between short grief to be followed hereafter by constant joy and short joy to be followed hereafter by eternal grief. Cf. Matth. v. 3, 4; Luke vi. 21; 2 Cor. vii. 10.

7. Nothing is more sad and pernicious than that Christians also in their intercourse with each other yield themselves so often to loveless calumny and forget the words of the Lord Jesus, Matth. vii. 1–6. In this connection attention should be called to rash contradiction and hasty judging which are often the effects of ignorance or disgraceful passion; to censoriousness which contrary to men's own better conviction magnifies the faults of their neighbour and overlooks his good parts, in direct opposition to the Apostolic precept, 1 Cor. xiii. 4–7; to calumny, slander, tale-bearing, back-biting, etc., on which vices Reinhard's *System of Christian Morality*, 4th ed. I. p. 681–693 deserves to be consulted. [Also Jeremy Taylor's Sermons,—*The Good and Evil Tongue—Slander and Flattery—The Duties of the Tongue.*—M.]. He justly observes that partial and passionate reviewers are not unfrequently guilty of these vices to an eminent degree. Compare also Bayle's *Dissertations sur les libelles difamatoires*, in Vol. IV. of his Dictionnaire, and the capital sketch of an accomplished calumniator in Gellert's *Moralische Vorlesungen*, p. 647 etc. It is self-evident how ill all this accords with the duties of Christian brotherly love. Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 5; Eph. iv. 25; Col. iii. 13.

8. "The law protects our neighbour by the precept of brotherly love; he who notwithstanding injuriously assails him, violates the protecting law itself, sets himself above the law and makes choice of that part of the law he means to observe or not to observe; but in doing so, he ceases to be a doer of the law." von Gerlach.

9. The Christian must also show in his daily life that he is influenced in all things by the sense of dependence which is the real foundation of the religious and moral life. James in concert with Solomon (Prov. xxvii. 1), with our Lord Himself (Matth. vi. 34) and with the Epistle to the Hebrews (ch. vi. 3) urges this upon his readers. Many a sinful action would remain undone, many a hasty step would not be taken, if the words "If the Lord will and we live" were not only on the lips but in the hearts of men. Compare the treatise of Morus, "*de homine submittente se Deo,*" *in Opusculis*, II p. 123. sqq.

10. There is not a more extensive region of sin than that on which James allows us to cast

a solitary glance (v. 17), the region of sins of omission, and again none in which not a few exhibit less concern. How many are perfectly satisfied if in their opinion they have not *done* any thing in thought, in word or in deed, which conflicts with the love of God and of our neighbour, although they have never accused themselves of that which unconsciously or designedly they omitted to do! Many secretly object to such simple and self-evident exhortations as those in vv. 13–16, that they have *known* it all a long time without considering that *knowing* without *doing* is altogether inexcusable, cf. Jno. iii. 17.—"The omission of good is the commission of evil. In this manner we actually may become thieves and murderers; *e. g.*, the priest and the Levite who passed by the unfortunate sufferer, offended by omitting to observe the sixth commandment. This omission of good is also connected with slackness in doing good; gradually men become more and remiss in doing until at last all love of and longing for good leaves them and this is the death of which we must be on our guard. Beware, therefore, of procrastination! By deferring a thing we ought to do from day to day, we come to lessen its importance and soon forget it altogether. Such negligences disclose to us the slothfulness of our heart, a most dangerous and critical state of disease." Viedebandt.

[v. 12. Sanderson: "The words of St. James assert that there is but *one* Lawgiver—not one selected out of *many*, nor *one* above all the rest, but one *exclusively;* that is, *one*, and but *one alone*, who is able to save and destroy. What was usually applied to the prerogatives of Kings, may be justly said of the *conscience* of every man, that *it is subject to none but God, and knows no superior upon earth.* Memorable is the observation of the Emperor *Maximilian*, "To offer to domineer over the conscience, is to assault the citadel of heaven." *That* man is a plunderer of the Divine Glory, and an invader of the authority that belongs to God, whosoever he be, that claims a *right* over the consciences of men, or usurps upon them. Let the *popes* of Rome, and the train of canonists, jesuits and sycophants, that flatter and fawn upon them, clear themselves, if they can, of this sacrilege; and let such as *submit their consciences* to the power of any creature, which only ought to be subject to God, be careful lest by transferring the honour of that service that belongs to God, to any creature upon earth, they make a god of that creature, and so, in effect become guilty of *idolatry.*

From this first *conclusion* thus proved, follows this remarkable inference, that the *proper rule* of the conscience is that which *God*, the Supreme Lawgiver, has prescribed to it; and besides that, there is no other that ought to be admitted.

Yet this hinders not, that there may be other lawgivers of an *inferior order*, who by authority *derived* to them from the *Supreme power*, may have a just right to make laws, and consequently to bind the conscience to obedience. We do not say that God has committed to the Magistrate a power to oblige the consciences of his people by laws, but rather (to speak with more care and propriety) that God has given to the magistrate a jurisdiction to make laws, which by virtue alone of the *Divine* authority, do oblige the consciences of the subject; for properly speaking, the Magistrate does not oblige the conscience to obey the *law*, but God obliges the conscience to obey the magistrate."—M.].

[v. 17. Wordsworth: This conclusion of St James is added as the summing up of the argument, in the same manner as the aphorism with which St. Paul closes his reasonings concerning a *doubting conscience*, where he says, "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin," that is, whenever a man *does* anything without *being persuaded* in his mind that he *may* lawfully do it, he is guilty of sin. Rom. xiv. 23.

St. James appears to have his eye here on this statement of St. Paul.

St. James adds to it another maxim of general import, viz., that whensoever a man *omits* to do anything which he is persuaded in his own mind that he *ought* to do, he is guilty of sin.

Thus these two Apostolic verdicts, delivered in a similar manner, constitute two fundamental rules of human action, as to what men are *bound to forbear doing*, and as to what *they are bound to do.*

Those persons whom St. Paul addressed, were tempted to do many things, which they did not, in their consciences, approve; and the Apostle warns them, that if they do any thing against their conscience, they commit sin.

They to whom St. James wrote, were vainglorious of their religious *knowledge;* but they were not careful to show forth their religious *knowledge* by religious *practice;* and the Apostle teaches them that their knowledge will only increase their guilt, unless they *do* what they *know* to be right.

Hence, while it is sin to shun knowledge, and there is *some* sin of *ignorance* (cf. *Augustine* 6, 661), and it is a sin to shut the ears to instruction; and it is a duty to *get knowledge*, to *increase* in knowledge, to *abound* in knowledge, we must beware not to *rest* in knowledge. We must *add* to our *knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity.* Without these *knowledge* is unprofitable; nay, will only increase our condemnation. See Sanderson 8, p. 282–284. Cf. Luke xii. 47; Jno. ix. 41; xv. 22; and see the woes pronounced on *Chorazin* and *Capernaum*, Matth. xi. 21.—M.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Friendship with the world, enmity of God.—The Christian's relation to the world which sursounds him.—On spiritual adultery, cf. Hos. ii. 1–19.—The Scripture should never utter a single word in vain to the Christian, cf. Jno. x. 35*b*.—The Spirit that dwells in Christians is decidedly opposed to every manifestation of hatred and envy.—God is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think (understand), Eph. iii. 20.—God resisteth the proud but giveth grace to the humble: 1. This *is* not otherwise according to the voice of history and experience; 2. It *cannot* be otherwise, if we consider the relation of God and the sinner; 3. It *shall* not be otherwise if God is to be glorified and the sinner preserved; 4. It *will* never be otherwise and the sinner had therefore better

lay it to heart.—(vv. 6, 7). How God stands to the humble Christian and how the humble Christian stands to his God.—The necessity of a constantly renewed conversion towards God after every new aberration.—The greatest *demand* of the Christian life: draw near to God, and its greatest *consolation:* He will draw nigh to you.—The insignificance of clean hands without a clean heart; the inward and the outward must be indissolubly united in conversion.—The beginning of conversion, the end of every sinful joy.—If we did not remain so far from God, God also would not remain so far from us.—The commandment of inward purification can never be fulfilled without prayer, Ps. li. 12.—(vv. 10, 11). The Christian life a union of humility and love. He who truly knows and humbles himself before God will neither have the desire nor the courage to judge his brother uncharitably.—Sinning against our brother is also sinning against God.—Slander in religious associations and Christian circles: 1, The traces, 2, the sources, 3, the fruits of this vice.—He that speaks evil of others injures thereby 1, the brother whom he calumniates, 2, the neighbour who listens to him, 3, but most of all himself.—The Christian indeed is called to be a doer of the word but not in order to be a judge of the law.—The relation in which God stands to the transgressor of the commandment of love: 1, as the Lawgiver, 2, as the only Lawgiver, 3, as the only Lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy.—(v. 13, etc.). On our dependence on God even in the actions of our daily life.—Difference between the Christian-minded and the worldly-minded merchant.—Christian and unchristian travelling. Our ignorance of the future, 1, the alarm it occasions, 2, the benefit it works.—"What is your life?" Different answers to this question from the standpoint 1, of experience, 2, of faith.—Life a vapor which is to ascend fragrant as incense.—How much cause have we not only to think but also to say: "If the Lord will and we live!" 1. Reasons for this frame of mind: *a.* death or want of ability prevent not seldom the execution of our best plans; *b.* the plans of others often conflict with ours or ours with theirs and both neutralize one another; *c.* we are often deprived of the opportunity or the desire to carry out our plans, but all under the guidance of God. 2. Fruits of this frame of mind: it will *a.* make us careful in laying, *b.* thankful for the success, *c.* submissive and satisfied with the frustration of our most cherished plans and desires.—Memento mori, cf. Ps. xc. and ciii.—The problem of life must never be considered apart from its direct connection with death.—Lawful and unlawful glorying on the Christian standpoint.—The great chasm between knowing, willing and doing.—The greatness of seemingly little sins of omission.—"He that knoweth to do good, etc." Extended application of this rule to the field of Christian philanthrophy and of Missions among the heathen.

Starke: Luther:—Envious men are not the temples of the Holy Ghost, ch. iii. 14, 15; 2 Tim. i. 7.—The proud instead of the honour, after which they run, receive shame and dishonour, Matth. xxv. 33.—The more of humility, the more of grace; if in valleys some hollows are deeper than others, the water collects in them, Luke v. 8.—Humility of heart is the most certain way not only to the love of our fellow-men but also to honour from God Himself. Luke xiv. 11.

Hedinger:—The enemy is not conquered by sleep. Take the sword of the Spirit, the helmet of hope, the shield of faith, then thou art equipped for the contest, Eph. vi. 11.—Nothing unclean is able to combine with God, the most pure Being, Is. i. 16.—Humility the surest road to constant exaltation, Matth. xxiii. 12.—To speak evil of our brother does more harm than is generally thought; as many words, so many wounds are struck in the conscience, Ps. lii. 4; cxl. 12.

Nova Bibl. Tub.:—A pious man always guards his tongue lest it judge his neighbour and defame him, Rom. xiv. 13.

Luther:—God gave us His law, not that we should censure it, but keep it. Deut. vii. 11.

Starke:—Human legislators are able to render those, who obey their commandments, to some extent happy, but they can neither save them nor themselves; God is able to do both perfectly.—The Apostle does not absolutely disallow commerce, he only blames those who are so covetous that they forget God in their business and think that every thing depends on their cunning, chasing and running, and do not remember that they cannot do any thing without the grace of God. Trading and chaffering has been peculiar to the Jews before and after the birth of Christ, especially to those who have lived out of Canaan, their country. For because they had no landed property among foreign nations, they were compelled to make their living by trade, which is the case now, if only it were done as it ought to be done.

Nova Bibl. Tub.:—O wretched man that layest out such great plans, dost thou not know that to-morrow God may require thy soul at thy hands? Luke xii. 19, 20.

Langii op.:—Nothing is more common than that the healthiest bodies of any age are all of a sudden attacked by divers diseases, Job. xiv. 2.

Hedinger:—The will of God is the sole rule of Christians in all matters relating to the body or the soul, as in the case of Christ and Paul, Jno. iv. 34; 1 Cor. iv. 19; Acts xxi. 13, 14.—The will of God permits also evil but turns it to the welfare of His children, Gen. l. 20.—An evil cause and a stubborn mind full of self-glorying go generally together, ch. iii. 14; Rom. i. 30.

Langii op.:—Ignorance is no excuse in cases where knowledge might have been had; but if a man knows better and yet is unfaithful and disobedient, he only aggravates his guilt accordingly, Luke xii. 47, 48.

(v. 11) Stier:—I must judge in my heart in order to preserve myself from evil and to retain only what is good; I owe it in love to my brother to censure and exhort him in order to make him better and to prosper his soul. But this is altogether different from haughty, angry rebuking and scolding when I converse with some one about his sin; but the worst of all, and that which uniformly begets still greater discord, is the, alas, nowhere uncommon although thoroughly concealed vice of backbiting, which Luther in his Catechism has wisely ranged under

the eighth commandment. People discourse without vocation or duty, from sheer wantonness with a hateful temper of one's supposed sin to another; speak evil of their brother behind his back, as a false brother, instead of saying it sincerely to his face. Thus acted the heathen in the Apostolic age towards the Christians, wantonly refused to see their good works and preferred to backbite them as evil-doers (1 Pet. ii. 12). Thus still act nowadays baptized heathen towards the godly, saying of them and burdening them with all manner of evil falsely. If this is done also among those who pretend to be brethren, verily the Holy Spirit strongly testifies against it and rather teaches Christians for their part not to deal thus with the children of the world. Where such backbiting takes place there is never a good conscience or a courageous answer to the questions: would I say this of him, if he were present? why do I not first tell him? why and for what purpose do I now speak of it? —There is neither obedience of duty nor intent of love; here speaks and judges one's own presumptuous, haughty mind, hence it runs so soon into judging falsely or even, if the matter were really so, into *condemning*, into damning judgment, which is at any rate absolutely forbidden.

(v. 17). We are unprofitable servants before the Most Highest; that is certain, for all profitableness comes only from Him; but it is just because He makes us profitable that we are bound to do whatever is commanded us, to be diligent in doing good, as we know it, according to the will of God. James puts this lastly in the place of every self-willed doing of this or that. If we suffer ourselves to be found in good works aspiring for eternal life, then our earthly life verily has become more than a vapor, which vanishes away, then it is the seed-time of the great harvest of true gain.

JAKOBI: (v. 15):—"If the Lord will and I live." There are indeed not a few Christians who take the precept of our text literally and think that they are sinning if in speaking of the future, they do not every time employ such a pious addition. But if faith here borders almost on superstition and if we actually find the traces of such superstition even in many otherwise enlightened Christians, is it not true that this momentous saying "If the Lord will and I live" sinks down into a mere conventionalism, if we carry it on our lips on every trifling occasion? and is it not to be feared that that which we should always utter only with a profound and most living sense of our impotence and the omnipotence of God, degenerates into a mere, blind habit? Let us apply also in this respect the mighty saying of St. Paul: "The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power," 1 Cor. iv. 20.—

NEANDER:—"If the Lord will and we live." It is evident that James in saying this did not insist upon it, that we should always express such a condition in words. Such expressions might easily degenerate into mere forms and those Churches, in virtue of their whole tendency, were apt to turn every thing into a mere form. James, as we have already seen, is fond of naming the specific instead of the general thought, and instead of expressing the general thought of the uncertainty and dependence of our whole earthly life, makes use of language calculated to indicate the general thought by its application to a specific case.

HEUBNER: (v. 15):—James will appear to some as a pietist, but just from what he says we may know what genuine, sincere piety is. He is truly pious, whose piety interpenetrates also his whole heart, his whole life and his whole doing. To carry on even his earthly affairs with God characterizes the Christian: "with God" is his motto in every thing, Col. iii. 17.—The spirit of enterprise without religion is always pride.—

LISCO: (vv. 7-10):—All our doing is at the same time the work of God.—(vv. 11-17) The danger of pride: 1, It misleads us to judge others uncharitably (vv. 11, 12); 2, it seduces us to trust over much in our own strength (vv. 13-17).—The unchristian element in the conduct of temporal affairs.—

PORUBSZKY: (vv. 4-6):—Worldly and spiritual.—(vv. 6, 7) Be subject to God.—(vv. 7, 8) The greatest task of human willing.—(vv. 8-10) Three steps to genuine repentance: 1, grief; 2, faith; 3, work.—(vv. 11, 12). Our judgment of others condemns ourselves.—(vv. 13-17). Of assurance in our worldly affairs.—

WEINECK: (vv. 13-15):—In what Christian families may find comfort in the retrospect of a departing year.—

WOLF: (vv. 13-16):—Man may become the destroyer but not the architect of his happiness.

[WHITBY: v. 11:—The great exception which both the unbelieving Jews and the Judaizing Christians among them had against the believing Gentiles was this "they observed not their feasts or Sabbaths and that they were not circumcised," whence they concluded they differed little from the heathens. This was the thing for which the Christian fathers did contend against them; viz. that the ancient patriarchs of old were acceptable to God, and consequently the Christians, and especially the converted Gentiles, might be acceptable to God without the observation of these feasts and Sabbaths or of circumcision.

v. 15. It was a rule of Ben Syra (Buxt. *Flor.* p. 4) "Let no man say he will do any thing, unless he first say, If the Lord will:" who also adds, that "one died before night, for refusing to add this." And when Alcibiades had said to Socrates, "I will do so if you will," Socrates (Plat. *Alcib.* 1, *in fine*) tells him he ought to have said, ἐὰν ὁ θεὸς ἐθέλῃ, "if God will." Not that we are obliged always to say thus (Rom. xv. 28), but only still to own our dependence upon Divine Providence.—M.].

[v. 17. Εἰδότι οὖν. Menander says: "It is manifest folly to know what we ought to do and not do it.—M.].

[MACKNIGHT:—v. 8. This and other exhortations of the like kind found in Scripture imply, that in matters of religion and virtue men must coöperate with the grace of God by their own earnest endeavours.—M.].

[PYLE: v. 11. As to you, dear brethren, who are already converted to Christianity, be sure to avoid that pernicious custom of slander and

rash censure. Remember, that whoever hastily and unjustly condemns another man, reflects upon religion itself, sets up for a judge and makes himself wiser than the Divine Law. And such an one must not pretend to be a true disciple of that law, while he sets himself above it.—M.].

[v. 17. Now this, or any other crime, must be greater in a Christian than in any other man; because he, by the clear revelation of the Gospel, has or ought to have better notions of his duty, and a stronger sense of his religious obligations.—M.].

[Burkitt: v. 17. Let us learn hence, that to sin against light and knowledge, is a very heinous aggravation of sin, because the knowledge of our duty lays us under the greatest obligation to do it; and that the greater advantages and opportunities any man has of knowing his duty, and the more knowledge he sins against in not doing it, the greater is his sin, and the more grievous will be his condemnation.—M.].

[v. 4. There is a sense in which a man may be a friend of the world and yet remain the friend of God, and this seeming paradox is the duty of every Christian and more especially of the minister of Christ. He must be the world's true friend by telling the world its faults, exposing its corrupt maxims in a spirit of tender love and solicitude by preaching the truth of the everlasting Gospel and endeavouring to gain the world to Jesus Christ.]

v. 8. The Father, in the parable, running to meet the returning prodigal, a Divine illustration of the words "Draw nigh to God and He will draw nigh to you."—Outward lustrations are not sufficient, the heart must be purified as well. ἁγνίσατε καρδίας, literally "make chaste your hearts" alludes to their spiritual adultery (v. 4), and the whole clause may be applied to *baptized* Christians whose hearts are in the world.

v. 18. Debarim Rabba, § 9. p. 261. 1 we read as follows: "Our rabbis tell us a story, which happened in the days of Rabbi Simeon the son of Chelpatha. He was present at the circumcision of a child and stayed with his father to the entertainment. The father brought out wine for his guests, that was seven years old, saying, *With this wine will I continue for a long time to celebrate the birth of my new-born son.* They continued supper till midnight. At that time, Rabbi Simeon arose and went out, that he might return to the city in which he dwelt. On the way he saw the angel of death walking up and down. He said to him, Who art thou? He answered, I am the messenger of God. The rabbi said, Why wanderest thou about thus? He answered, I slay those persons who say, We will do this or that and think not how soon death may overpower them: that man with whom thou hast supped, and who said to his guests, *With this wine will I continue for a long time to celebrate the birth of my new-born son,* behold the end of his days is at hand, for he shall die within thirty days."

v. 16. Clarke cites from an old English work "The godly man's picture drawn by a Scripture pencil" the words: "Some of those who despise religion say, *Thank God we are not of this holy number!* They who thank God for their unholiness, had best go ring the bells for joy that they shall never see God."

v. 18, The same author cites the following from Saady's *Gulistan*: "I knew a merchant who used to travel with a hundred camels laden with merchandise and who had forty slaves in his employ. This person took me one day to his warehouse and entertained me a long time with conversation good for nothing. 'I have,' said he, 'such a partner in Turquestan, such and such property in India, a bond for so much cash in such a province, a security for such another sum.' Then, changing the subject, he said, 'I purpose to settle in Alexandria, because the air of that city is salubrious.' Correcting himself, he said, 'No, I will not go to Alexandria; the African Sea (the Mediterranean) is too dangerous. But I will make another voyage and after that I will retire into some quiet corner of the world, and give up mercantile life.' I asked him, what voyage he intended to make? He answered, 'I intend to take brimstone to Persia and China, where I am informed it brings a good price; from China I shall take porcelain to Greece; from Greece I shall take gold tissue to India; from India I shall carry steel to Haleb (Aleppo); from Haleb I shall carry glass to Yemen (Arabia Felix); and from Yemen I shall carry printed goods to Persia. This accomplished, I shall bid farewell to mercantile life, which requires so many troublesome journeys and spend the rest of my life in a store.' He said so much on this subject, till at last he wearied himself with talking: then turning to me, he said, 'I entreat thee Saady, to relate to me something of what *thou* hast seen and heard in thy travels.' I answered 'Hast thou never heard what a traveller said, who fell from his camel in the desert of Yoor?' *Two things only can fill the eye of a covetous man —contentment or the earth that is cast on him when laid in his grave.*"—M.].

Compare also on

v. 8. Bp. Hall. The duty of drawing nigh to God. Works, v. 745.
Bp. Smalridge. Of double-mindedness. 4 Sermons. Sermons, 849.

v. 10. Robert Hall, Humility before God. Notes of Sermons. Works, v. 812.

v. 11. Barrow. Against detraction. Works, i. 523.
Sydney Smith. On Slander. Sermons, 257.
Chalmers. The guilt of calumny. Posth. Works, vi. 12.

v. 12. Bp. Sanderson. Prælectiones.

IX. SEVENTH ADMONITION.

DENUNCIATION AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE IMPENDING JUDGMENT ON THE RICH *I. E.*, THE JUDAISTS PROPER, COUCHED IN PROPHETIC STYLE. EXHORTATION TO REPENTANCE OR TO THE PRESENTIMENT OF THE JUDGMENT.

CHAPTER V. 1–6.

1 Go to now, *ye* rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon *you*.[1]
2 Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are motheaten. Your gold and silver is
3 cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh[2]
4 as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days. Behold, the hire
of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud,[3]
crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord
5 of Sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have
6 nourished your hearts, as[4] in a day of slaughter.[5] Ye have condemned *and* killed the
just; *and* he doth not resist you.

Verse 1. [1] Cod. Sin. inserts ὑμῖν after ἐπερχομέναις [so Vulg. Syr. Copt. Æth. Arm.—M.]
Lange: Well then, ye rich, weep unto howling over your calamities which are drawing near on you.
[Go to now, ye rich, weep howling over your miseries which are coming upon you.]

Verse 2. Lange: Your riches are [already] corrupting, and your garments are become motheaten.
[. . . . corrupted . . . . M.]

Verse 3. [[2] Cod. Sin. A. inserts ὁ ἰὸς after σάρκας ὑμῶν.—M.]
Lange: Your gold and the silver is rusted and their rust will be a testimony against you and shall consume your flesh [σάρκας, your carnalities] as fire. Ye have heaped up treasure in the last [these last] days.
[Your gold and your silver are eaten up with rust and their rust shall be for a testimony to you . . . . Ye heaped up treasure in the last days.—M.]

Verse 4. [[3] Cod. Sin. B. read ἀφυστερημένος for ἀπεστερημένος.—M.]
Lange: . . . . .which hath been kept back, crieth out from you, and the cries of the reapers have come to the ears of the Lord of hosts.
[. . . . have entered into the ears of the Lord of hosts.—M.]

Verse 5. [4] Cod. Sin. A. B. omit ὡς before ἐν; so Vulg. and other versions; found in Rec., G. K. and is probably an exegetical addition.
[[5] Aeth. Pell Platt's edition. "*ut qui saginat bovem in diem mactationis.*—M.]
Lange: Ye have lived high on earth. ye have lived wantonly and fattened [like flesh] your hearts [as] in the day of slaughter.
[Ye lived in luxury on the earth and wantoned (Alford); ye fattened your hearts in . . . . M.]

Verse 6. Lange: Ye have condemned, ye have killed the Just. He doth not resist you [any longer opposing and saving].
[Ye condemned, ye killed the Just One. He doth not resist you.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

1. *Analysis:* The Judaists exhorted to repentance or to realize a presentiment of the judgment, v. 1.—Their condition: spiritual self-delusion, the corruptness and self-consumption of their supposed riches, vv. 2, 3.—Their positive sins resulting from such spiritual self-delusion. Their sins against the reapers of the harvest in Israel.—Their unsuspecting assurance of their life of indulgence in the very day of their judgment. The crime of the murder of the Just One, vv. 4–6.

The Judaists exhorted to repentance or to realize a presentiment of the judgment.

VER. 1. **Well then, ye rich.**—Concerning the rich see Introduction, ch. i. 10 and ii. 6, 7. That the reference is not to the outwardly rich but to the rich in the sense of Old Testament (Ps. lxxiii.; Is. v.), Gospel (Matth. xix. 24; Rev. iii. 17) and symbolical usage may be expected from an Apostolical man, to say nothing of an Apostle. The ordinary construction put on this term would lead us to expect either that the Epistle ought to have driven the outwardly rich from the Church or that they would have excluded the Epistle from the Canon. But just as the Jewish Christians themselves have ceased to be known so also the Gentile Christian Church has suffered the majestic prophetical penitential discourse of the faithful Christian Apostle to the Jews to be reduced to the conception of a severe moral lecture. The repetition of ἄγε νῦν does not prove that the reference here is to the same persons who are addressed in ch. iv. 13 (as Huther supposes). Nor is the reference at all to individuals as such; the persons addressed there are Judaists in a most perilous condition, while those addressed here are those who according to the last warning harden themselves by the self-delusion of their being theocratically rich. The entire prophetical lamentation must be judged according to its analogies in the Old Testament (Is. ii. 22; Ch. iii. 9, 19 etc.) the words of Christ (Matth. xxiii.) and the Apocalypse (ch. xviii.).

Weep unto howling.—De Wette and al. take this as an exhortation to shed the tears of repentance; Huther agrees with Calvin who denies that there is any reference to repentance and considers the passage to be "*simplex denun-*

ciatio judicii dei, qua eos terrere voluit ab spe veniæ." Wiesinger takes a middle position: that the design of James, as in the case of the prophets of the Old Testament, is nevertheless none other than that of moving them, if possible, to turn from their perverse course. Huther, who objects that James nowhere intimates such design, overlooks 1, that also the strongest menaces of judgment in the Old Testament are at any rate hypothetical (see the Book of Jonah, Jer. xviii. 7 etc.), 2, that the most assured foreseeing of the inevitability of the judgment as a whole still involves the possibility of individuals being wakened and saved in virtue of such menace, 3, that the Divine fore-announcement of such a judgment is at the same time made as a testimony of the truth for the future and designed to serve other generations as a warning and to conduce to their salvation. The strict construction of Huther is still more striking because he disputes Semler's exposition of the Imperative, viz. "*stilo prophetico imperat, ut rem certissimam demonstret,*" and maintains that the proper force of the Imperative ought to be retained. This would therefore be a command to weep without any hope of salvation. The Participle ὀλολύζοντες (ὀλολύζειν used often to describe howling with reference to the near approach of the judgment, Is. xiii. 6; xiv. 31 etc.) denotes weeping accompanied by constant howling, *i. e.* increasing unto howling.

Over your miseries.—The impending judgments, not specified by the Apostle, but further alluded to only with respect to their premonitory symptoms.

Which are drawing near on you.—There is hardly room to doubt that James refers primarily to the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem; so Thomas Aquinas, Grotius, Michaelis and al. understand it. Huther cannot substantiate by any proof the remark that "they (Thomas Aquinas, etc.) are not wrong in this respect, because in the Apostle's mind the destruction of Jerusalem and the last judgment had not yet been distinguished." The ταλαιπωρίαι are rather said to be ἐπερχόμεναι, already approaching; whereas a very patient waiting is necessary with respect to the coming of the Lord, v. 7, etc., although in the light of Christian hope (not of chiliastic calculation) it is near at hand. *On you*, by which Luther and others further define the approaching judgments, follows not from the literal expression but from the connection; ἐπί also contains an allusion, favouring the construction. [See Appar. Crit. Note 1.—M.].

Their condition: spiritual self-delusion, the corruptness and self-consumption of their supposed riches. vv. 2, 3.

Ver. 2. **Your riches are corrupted.**—The verb σήπω (ἅπαξ λεγ. in N. T.), to make rotten or putrid, destroy by rottenness, signifies in 2 Perf. Pass. (as here) to rot, moulder, to be rotten or also to be in a state of rotting fermentation. But it has also the more general sense, to corrupt, to consume oneself (Sir. xiv. 19). [σέσηπα is Perf. Middle.—M.]. The verb therefore does not necessitate us to understand with Gebser and al. πλοῦτος=*frumenta*. The main question here is to determine whether this and the next expression denote the natural immanent judgment of sin as portents of the positive judgments, or the latter (Grotius, Bengel), so that future events are prophetically described as having already taken place (de Wette, Wiesinger, Huther and al.). But the reference is evidently to the former; the corrupting of riches and the moth-eaten garments denote immanent, natural corruptions. But here, as in the prophets (Is. xxviii. 1, 2; ch. xxxiii. 11, 12; Jer. vii. etc.) and in our Lord's eschatological discourse (Matth. xxiv. 28) these natural corruptions, as the judgment of the self-dissolution (—consumption) of sin, are in their products the tokens of positive judgment. But the riches must be taken figuratively, not literally as is generally done. The prophetical idea of the rich corresponds to the prophetical idea of the riches. It denotes therefore externalized Judaistic righteousness with all its national prerogatives, of course connected with that outward worldly prosperity and ease which are the outward complements of such self-righteousness. It is matter of historical record that at the time when James wrote this Epistle, Jewish affairs had the appearance of spiritual prosperity (in point of orthodoxy and world-holiness), as well as of worldly flourishing in the reign (in part at least) of Herod Agrippa II. (See my Apost. Age. I. pp. 307, 312, 324).

And your garments.—Doubtless in the sense of the splendid garment ch. ii. 2.

Are become moth-eaten, σητόβρωτος, Job xiii. 28: not found in Classic Greek and not elsewhere in the New Testament.

Ver. 3. **Your gold and your silver are eaten up with rust.**—κατιόω is ἅπαξ λεγ. in the New Testament. Gold and silver do not contract rust, hence Hornejus observes that it is *populariter dictum*, which is approved by Huther. Pott interprets the striking expression of the dimness of their burnish, others otherwise. According to Huther James did not anxiously calculate the difference of metals in his vivid concrete depiction; but this would be an intensely popular mode of expression. The words Is. i. 22, "Thy silver is become dross" are not a merely popular expression; on the contrary they are designed to bring out the unnatural fact that the princes of Israel are become rebellious and companions of thieves. It is then an unnatural phenomenon to which James adverts, of course in figurative language. It is as unnatural for gold and silver to be eaten up with rust as for the glory of Israel to be as corrupted as the glory of other nations corrupts, which may be compared to base metals.

And their rust shall be a testimony against you.—Wiesinger, with whom Huther agrees, proposes the following interpretation: in the consuming of their treasures, to be brought about by an outward judgment, they see depicted their own. But the loss of outward wealth under the influence of outward corruption is by no means evidence of the inward corruption of the losers. Oecumenius supposes that the rust on their gold and silver shall testify against the hardness of their heart, because they did not use them in doing good. This is correct as far as the reference is doubtless to a corruption inherent in their circumstances, but it lacks the due appreciation of the figurative

sense: the rusting of your gold and silver, of your glory, represented by your leading men (see Is. i. 22, 23), shall be a token that the nation is corrupted in its rich men in general. And this was actually the case. The leading men who in the spiritual life ought to have shone like burnished silver and gold were rusted in legalism and dragged the majority of the self-righteous people into their own corruption.

And shall consume your flesh.—The Plural σάρκες is differently explained. The word stands simply for ὑμᾶς (Baumgarten), it denotes their well-fed bodies (Augusti), the fleshy parts of the body as contrasted with the bones (Huther who refers to 2 Kings ix. 36; and particularly to Mich. iii. 2, 3). But these passages contain no allusion to a consuming fire; fire consumes bones as well as flesh. We therefore assume that the term *flesh* is here used in a bad sense as in Gen. vi. 3; Jer. xvii. 5 and Jno. iii. 6, and that the Plural describes the life of the rich as exhibited in the carnalities or externals of religious, civil or individual life, in which they take delight. That consuming rust of the decayed, defunct and deadly legalism beginning at the gold and silver with which they decorate themselves, eats through the flesh of their customs, ceremonies and earthly possessions to the very destruction of their life. It is a rust which has the consuming energy of fire (Ps. xxi. 22; Is. x. 16, 17). The *rotten fixity*, described as *rust*, in its last stage transforms itself into the *fire* of a *revolutionary movement*, into a fanatical, *consuming conflagration* of rebellion (see Rev. xix. 20), or in brief: absolutism becomes revolution. It is the consummated national self-dissolution, as it fully developed itself in the Jewish war and in Jerusalem besieged. The reference therefore on the one hand, is neither to consuming grief and want (Erasmus and al.), nor, on the other, already to the real, positive judgments (Calvin, Grotius, Wiesinger, Huther and al.). With respect to ὡς πῦρ, Wiesinger, who adopts the punctuation of Cod. A and Oecumenius, and follows Grotius and Knapp, connects it with ἐθησαυρίσατε: "*tanquam ignem opes istas congessistis, et quidem ipsis extremis temporibus.*" Wiesinger cites as an analogy θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν, Rom. ii. 5, to which Huther rightly objects that in the words ἐθησαυρίσατε ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις the principal stress rests on ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. This is sufficient; his further remark that the fire denotes already positive judgment we consider, for the reason already given, to be incorrect, but this fire points to positive judgment. ὡς also is against Wiesinger's construction, and so does the over bold metaphor: ye have as it were gathered fire in gathering your wealth.

Ye have heaped up treasure.—The verb requires no definite specification of the object and the supply of ὀργήν (according to Rom. ii. 5. Calvin and al.) is superfluous and arbitrary. Moreover, the treasure, as Huther remarks, has been specified before.

In the last days.—Not perchance the last days, and the last days are neither the last days of life, nor the last days before the advent of Christ (Huther). James refers to the last days before the final national judgment, alluded to in v. 1, but not yet described. The gathering of treasure is done in the anticipation of a long happy future; this reprehensible heaping up treasure in the last days of their existence, immediately before the judgment involving not only the ruin of their treasure but also of their very existence, characterizes moreover their fearful want of apprehension (freedom from all misgiving and fear, assurance) and mad-like self-delusion. All their spiritual and worldly treasures are useless obstacles in the impending judgment, destined to vanish as the means of their self-delusion in order to make room for a fearful undeceiving. Thus the indication of positive judgment draws nearer, but the Apostle first refers to their decisive sins.

Their positive sins resulting from such spiritual self-delusion. Their sins against the reapers of the harvest in Israel. The unsuspecting assurance of their life of indulgence in the very day of their judgment. The crime of the murder of the Just One. Vv. 4–6.

VER. 4. **Behold the hire of the labourers.**—First decisive sin. Huther: "Injustice towards those who work for them;" Wiesinger: One case instead of many, a case moreover which clearly exposes the crying injustice of those rich men as the transgression of the express prohibition, Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Lev. xix. 13; Mal. iii. 5.—And this is to be the whole meaning of this passage! But in the first place it is inconceivable that those wandering trafficking Jews of the dispersion (ch. iv. 13) should all of a sudden be transformed into large landed proprietors, and in the second equally inconceivable that James should have occasion to reproach all the rich landlords of the dispersion with literally holding back the hire of their labourers. Here also we must again insist upon the symbolical sense of the passage. The first question is to determine the sense in which the term "the harvest of Israel" is used by the prophets (Is. ix. 3; Joel iii. 13), by John the Baptist (Matth. iii. 12), and by our Lord (Jno. iv. 35; Matth. ix. 38; cf. Rev. xiv. 15, 16).—It denotes the time when the theocratic seed of God in Israel has become ripe unto harvest; on the one hand unto the harvest of judgment, on the other unto the harvest of salvation. The latter idea predominates here. The harvest of Israel was the ripened spirit-produce of the Old Testament, as manifested in the work of Christ; in the reapers we may aptly see the Apostles (according to Jno. iv. 35), and the first Christians in general. From them the rich in Israel kept back the hire in that they rejected their testimony in unbelief. And thus the voices of those reapers cried into the ears of the Lord of hosts, *i. e.*, abandoning the figure: their sin against them cried out to God, even to God, the Lord of those hosts which were already on the point of approaching in order to execute the judgment of God on Israel.—The labourers, ἐργάται, see 1 Tim. v. 18. ἀμᾶν is ἅπαξ λεγ. in N. T. The expression imports moreover that Israel's whole harvest of blessing has been brought home by these labourers into the Christian Church and that there is no other harvest besides it.

Which hath been kept back.—We construe with Huther "the hire which hath been kept back, crieth out from you," ἀφ' ὑμῶν, as we

read in Gen. iv. 10. "the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground," because thus the injustice crying out for vengeance is laid to the charge of the evil-doers not to that of the labourers; the common construction "which hath been kept back by you" seems to be less opposed by taking ἀπό in the sense of ὑπό, than by the consideration that κράζει denotes a crying out for vengeance. Hence the connection is not: "the hire of the mowers crieth out and this crying has come to the ears of God" (Theile), but the crying out of the hire that has been kept back (Gen. xviii. 20; xix. 13) on the one hand, is completed on the other by the βοαί of the reapers or the gatherers of the harvest, first as cries of complaint and cries for help (see Heb. v. 7; Acts iv. 24 etc.; ch. xii. 5), and lastly also as cries for righteous recompense (Rev. vi. 10, 11). And these, even more than the former crying have entered into the ears of the Lord of hosts; which would yield this sense: not only the unbelief of the unbelieving Jews but also the distress of the believing Christians induce the Lord of hosts to send forth His hosts unto judgment; as indeed the destruction of Jerusalem was not only a visitation of judgment on Judaism but also a visitation of salvation on the Christian Church. The crying out of Christian blood for mercy to enemies reaches also its limit in the induration of unbelievers; moreover we should distinguish the reapers themselves from their βοαί, here made objective. The term "Lord of hosts" hardly renders prominent the power of God, as that of Lord of the heavenly hosts only (Wiesinger, Huther); He is also Lord of the earthly hosts according to the prophets (Is. vi. 3; xviii. 7; xxiv. 21; Amos ix. 4, 5), and also according to Christ (Matth. xxii. 7). [Bede suggests the following reason "*Dominum exercituum appellat, ad terrorem eorum, qui pauperes putant nullum habere tutorem.*" This is the only passage in the New Testament where the term "Lord of hosts" is used in direct discourse. Rom. ix. 29 is a quotation.—M.].

Second sin. v. 5. **Ye have lived high on earth.**—τρυφᾶν is ἅπαξ λεγ. in the N. T. It comprehends the ideas: to live softly, voluptuously, gloriously and also extravagantly. In LXX. (Neh. ix. 25 and Is. lxvi. 11) the fundamental idea is "to take delight in something to revel." σπαταλᾶν denotes living lewdly, luxuriously, especially in eating and drinking; but in LXX. (Ezek. xvi. 49 and Amos vi. 4) the idea of idle indulgence is decidedly predominant, probably also in 1 Tim. v. 6. Hence the two words would express not the definite antithesis *deliciæ et exquisita voluptas* and *luxuria atque prodigalitas* (Hottinger), but that of positive sumptuousness in pleasure and sensuality and of negative sumptuousness in effeminate, careless indolence. We might therefore translate "Ye have had your *delight* and have *settled down* on earth," or "ye have become worldly and effeminate," or "ye have bragged and made a show." The opposite order occurs in Luke xvi. 19: the daily wearing of holiday-apparel denotes the idler, the sumptuous living, revelry. Huther strikingly points out the contrast of this sumptuous mode of life and the toilsome life of the labourers, also the contrast of such revelling on earth and the complaint which is made to the Lord in heaven. But we must not overlook in this revelling on earth the thought, that the earth, the earthly, figuratively taken, was the foundation in which their revelling struck root, and that the day of slaughter is the principal antithesis of revelling.

And fattened your hearts.—τρέφειν in the opinion of several commentators denotes *fattening*, for the evident design of this clause is to show that the rich regarded and nourished their heart as an animal existence. Hence Huther is wrong in his correction of Luther, "to pasture your hearts," better: "to satiate." Luther's rendering is excellent and we should have retained it but for the necessity of holding fast to the other meaning that fattening the heart is at the same time indurating the heart (καρδία πεπωρωμένη). The heart, however, is not a paraphrastic description of the body or individuality but denotes inward life, the kernel of spiritual life (Acts xiv. 17). Wiesinger asserts that καρδία involves *per se* the idea of passionate fondness of enjoyment, but Luke xxi. 34 is the last passage which makes good his assertion.

In the day of slaughter.—On the omission of ὡς see Appar. Crit. Nor must ἐν be changed into εἰς. The rendering "as on a day of slaughter" (Luther, Wolf, Augusti) is consequently a double weakening of the thought. The comment of Calvin, Grotius, Bengel etc., that the day of slaughter is the day of sacrifice, when the slaughter of the victims is followed by banqueting, is altogether outside of the connection with the judgment. Calvin: "*Quia solebant in sacrificiis solemnibus liberalius vesci, quam pro quotidiano more. Dicit ergo divites tota vita continuare festum.*" Huther rightly observes that the term in question is never used in this sense. De Wette sees in it a comparison to beasts, which on the very day of slaughter eat in unconcern. Huther thinks this comparison inappropriate, since beasts do not eat more greedily on the day of slaughter than at any other time. But this refutation rests on a misunderstanding. Beasts* always eat greedily; their eating on the day of slaughter may therefore be used as a figure of the inordinate feasting of the obdurate on the very day of judgment. The analogy of 2 Pet. ii. 12 only tends to strengthen the appropriateness of this construction. The thought is further intensified by the consideration that while beasts are led to pasture and fattened for the day of slaughter, these men laid themselves voluntarily out for feasting in the very day of slaughter. But we may suppose that this point of comparison must not be dissociated from the general and more lofty meaning of ἡμέρα σφαγῆς, viz. that of a day of judgment (Jer. xii. 3; xxv. 34). In the last passage also the ideas "day of judgment" and "day of slaughter" are taken together in a literal sense, so also in Is. liii. 7; Rev. xix. 17, 18. But the day on which began Israel's day of judgment which is developing itself into a day of slaughter, was the day of Christ's crucifixion

* In German "*Fressen*" and "*Saufen*" are properly used to denote the *eating* and *drinking* of beasts, *i. e. inordinate, greedy* eating and drinking. Applied to human beings the terms are offensive and insulting, although the vulgar are apt to indulge in these choice terms with reference to themselves.—M.

which connected with the day of the destruction of Jerusalem becomes in a symbolical sense *one* day of visitation. The Aorists here, therefore, are not used to indicate that the conduct of the rich is to be viewed from the future day of judgment at the second coming of Christ (Huther), but because their carnal arrogance and unconcern in the devilish revelling of their hearts culminated just on the judgment-day of Israel. Since then their day of slaughter is in process of development. Just as they had therefore collected together the treasures of legal righteousness in the last days, while the old time was on the wane, so they had reached the climax of their self-indulgent worldliness on the last day, the day of judgment.—This leads to their third and greatest sin.

VER. 6. **Ye have condemned, ye have killed the Just.**—The fact of modern commentators disputing the exposition of Oecumenius, Bede and Grotius that *the Just* signifies Christ, proves how far they have wandered from the text in the treatment of this Epistle. Only think of James, the witness of Christ, at the end of his course calling out to the obdurate of all the people of Israel: Ye have condemned and killed the Just and they not to have understood him to refer to the rejection and crucifixion of Christ! But to what or to whom else did they think he was alluding? Gebser and Huther [also Alford—M.] take *δίκαιον* collectively for *τοὺς δικαίους*; *i. e.* oppressed, suffering Christians, and Huther says: "The ground of the persecution is implied in the word *δίκαιον* itself; the Singular should be taken collectively, the idea absolutely" (similarly Theile). But then surely Christ ought to be considered as standing at the head of these slain ones. Wiesinger (and de Wette) refers the term to continued persecution *ad mortem usque* and adds that all reference to Christ is so manifestly against the whole context of the passage, that refutation is altogether unnecessary. On the contrary, proof is almost unnecessary. Wiesinger objects first, that the Epistle is addressed to the dispersion. But at the Passover, when Christ was crucified, the dispersion also was represented at Jerusalem, and symbolically all Israel was already dispersed. The most important objection is the *Present οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν*. This *Present* is certainly difficult. But is it more convenient to affirm concerning the collectively just man, that he had been killed by those rich and that he was still living than to affirm as much concerning Christ? The Vulgate probably alludes to Christ in rendering "*non restitit*;" so Luther, "he hath not resisted you." But the *Present* forbids such a rendering. But also the common explanation: "Ye have killed the Just, he does not resist you" gives a thought which is not clear, at least not very distinct. It would perhaps be easier to suppose that the readers of the Epistle understood James to say: "Christ does not resist you in His members, He still endures willingly all persecutions in His sufferings." But would this thought be a fitting conclusion of the great denunciation of those obdurate people? Nor is it the idea "the just do not resist you." We understand therefore Bentley's conjecture of reading *ὁ κύριος* instead of *οὐκ* (see Ch. iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5; Prov. iii. 34); still more the explanation of Benson to take the clause interrogatively. Giving to *ἀντιτάσσεσθαι* the fullest Middle sense, the question would read thus: "Does He not bring up against you His army (as the executor of the punitive justice of the Lord of hosts)?" or "does He not rise against you in combat?" At least it is easy to understand that with a predominantly ascetic turn of mind such a question might have been asked. But considering the importance of the matter, the interrogative form ought to be more distinctly marked: does he not already march against you, march against you in the tempest of war? Besides such an explanation might easily obscure the thought of the continuous suffering which Christ endures in His people. Hence one might light on the idea of rebellion, as we have it in Rom. xiii. 2. He does not rebel against you, *i. e.* you are the rebels. But this again is not sufficiently clear. We read therefore: He stands no longer in your way, He does not stop you (in the way of death); He suffers you to fill up your measure. See Matth. xxiii. 32–38. And this dark, pregnant sentence is the concentration of the announcement that the judgment impending on them, is inevitable. [The clause "*οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν*" seems to be ironical: *He* lets you alone (Hos. iv. 17).—James was called by his contemporaries "the Just" and this reference to Jesus as "*the Just One*" is a touching illustration of his character, for a delineation of which the reader is referred to the Introduction.—M.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Both the Gospel and James are altogether free from any and every Ebionite one-sidedness that wealth, as such, is sinful and poverty, as such, meritorious. James allows the possession and use of earthly riches, but—*in majorem Dei gloriam*. While the rich are thus more privileged than others, they are also under doubly great obligations; but if they persistently acquit themselves of their discharge and use their riches only for the attainment of selfish ends which conflict with the law of love, then they are in all justice and reason liable to a *væ vobis divitibus* cf. Luke vi. 24; Matth. vi. 19–21.—

2. Earthly wealth is not an absolute but a relative obstacle to entering the kingdom of God; cf. Mark x. 23–25.—The history of many rich men, *e. g.* Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea shows that this obstacle may be overcome. But this is impossible where covetousness reigns supreme and adopts every means of preserving or increasing earthly possessions. Here applies the Apostolic warning, 1 Tim. vi. 17–19,—compare also Plutarch, *de cupiditate divitiarum*, and the saying of Seneca, *de benef.* II. c. 27, "*concitatior est avaritia in magnarum opum congestus*," also Sallust, *in Catil.* c. x. 4.—A life of luxurious indulgence as the concomitant of wealth and dependence on that wealth coupled with unfeeling contempt of one's brother, according to the teaching of Christ Himself, deserves the judgment Luke xvi. 25. And the history of the destruction of Jerusalem as well as innumerable incidents taken from the history of the kingdom of God confirm the fact that such rich men are

not rarely visited already here below with earthly calamity and outward distress apart from that judgment for eternity.

3. The rejection of the Messiah, to which James clearly alludes (v. 6), as the work of the prominent Jews, as the murder of the Innocent and the Just was not only a heinous crime *per se* (cf. Acts iii. 13–15), but also the first of a series of crimes enacted on the members of the Body, after they had first laid hands on the Head, which terminated at last in the horrors of the Jewish civil war and were punished with the fall of the city and the destruction of the temple.

4. Christianity imposes upon all men, blessed with earthly goods, the duty to ascertain and, if practicable, to satisfy the wants of their subordinates and servants and to consider themselves not as the lords but as the stewards of the capital confided to them, Luke xvi. 2; cf. Col. iv. 1.—Those who neglect this duty and oppress the poor have even pursuant to the tenor of the Old Testament to bear the dreadful punishment of God. See *e. g.* Ps. xxxvii.; Prov. xiv. 31; Eccl. v.–vii.

5. "Indulgence as it were fattens men for the punishment of hell—a figure taken from the sacrificial victims—*i. e.* ripens them so much the more for torments." Heubner on v. 5.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Wealth not an absolute superiority, poverty not an absolute evil.—Those who have most possessions on earth, have also to lose most in times of common suffering and tribulation.—Earthly riches from the nature of the case, are as transitory as their owners.—The true Christian an *omnia sua secum portans.*—The history of the rich fool is that of many (Luke xii. 16–20).—The degree to which the rich may be poor and the poor rich.—God's rich harvest-blessing changed into a curse through man's selfishness.—It is possible to do evil, but not to do it unpunished.—God is higher than the highest that oppress the poor, Eccl. v. 8.—The worldling's short joy followed by long pain.—The murder of the Just One the most horrid manifestation of outward selfishness.—The fact that evil is suffered here on earth no guarantee that it will not be punished (vv. 4–6).—Threefold sin of the rich; 1, oppression of the poor (v. 4), 2, selfish indulgence (v. 5), 3, murder of the Just One (v. 6).—How the crime of the rejection of Christ is still continued in various ways by many among the rich of this world.—The Christian has great cause to offer the prayer of Agur, Prov. xxx. 7–9.—The love of money the root of all evil (1 Tim. vi. 10) and of idolatry, Col. iii. 5.—

STARKE: CRAMER:—If you get riches, set not your heart on them, Ps. lxii. 11.—A man may be very rich and yet be very wicked, Ps. lxxiii. 12.

AUGUSTINE:—*Magna pietas! thesaurizat pater filiis; immo magna vanitas! thesaurizat moriturus morituris.*—Many who do not leave even children and know not whose shall be their riches (Luke xii. 20) are so possessed of avarice, that they loathe parting even with a penny. O, unhappy rich!

QUESNEL:—Thus the rich ground their hope on things which decay and perish. Foolish building! Matth. vii. 26, 27.

LANGII OP.:—If there were many pious rich men, who did husband their wealth as the stewards of God, the need of the poor would be greatly lessened, Luke viii. 2, 3; xxii. 35.

HEDINGER:—There are many who gather along with their gold a treasure of the wrath and vengeance of God, Rom. ii. 5.—To defraud labourers of their hire they have earned is a sin that crieth out to heaven and is sure to be followed by the curse and most fearful vengeance of God, 1 Thess. iv. 6.—The name of God "the Lord of hosts" is as terrible to the ungodly as it is consoling to the godly, Ps. xlvi. 11, 12.—Robbing the poor of their well-earned wages is murder, Ex. i. 13, 14.

STIER: (v. 6):—James refers primarily to the Lord, the Just One (Acts vii. 52) and he himself bore the honourable epithet "the Just," he here (*implicite*) humbly declines that epithet. Yet again—(here the inspiration of the Spirit affects the author of the Epistle so perceptibly and becomes here so remarkably prophetical that again)—he is unconsciously prophesying of himself. An author, who lived soon after the Apostles (Hegesippus), gives us a full account, which is doubtless correct in its main features, of the martyrdom of James the Just, the Lord's brother, shortly before the siege of Jerusalem. See Introd. p. 9 etc.; [also Excursus p. 18, etc.—M.].—(v. 4). Surely the words of James apply to many of our contemporaries, and many a proud palace ought to have the appropriate inscription.—"Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong."—The treatment which poor labourers experience at the hands of our money-aristocrats and merchant princes, who in their avarice are just what those names import and nothing more, who refuse to know the Lord God and our Saviour, cries *everywhere* loud enough in *our ears*, and is it likely that this crying has not also entered into the ears of the Lord of hosts? Of Him, who commanded even Moses to say in the law: "Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant, that is poor and needy—lest he cry against thee unto the Lord, and it be sin unto thee." Deut. xxiv. 14, 15.—

JAKOBI:—It is not the measure of wealth, but the measure of sin, which tells; everything depends upon the manner how earthly riches, be they great or small, have been acquired and are enjoyed; and hence those whom we can by no means call wealthy, may be just as ungodly and unrighteous, just as indulgent and voluptuous as those who are really rich. Our text is therefore addressed to all that are earthly-minded, to all worldly people that do not order their lives according to the rule "to have, as though they had, and to buy, as though they possessed not." 1 Cor. vii. 29 etc.

NEANDER:—James describes wealth in three different respects, viz. in garnered fruits of the field, in apparel, in gold and silver. All these, he says, the rich heap up without profit. Their treasures in gold and silver, for want of use, are eaten up with rust and will testify against them in judgment, finding them guilty because they suffered to perish for want of use that which they ought to have employed for the benefit of others. The rust consumes their own flesh, reminding them of their own perishableness and

of the punishment that awaits them in the judgment, because instead of gathering durable riches, they have heaped up the fire of Divine punishment in treasures destined to be eaten up with rust.

VIEDEBANDT: — A Christian, as has been strikingly said, may own worldly possessions like Abraham, David and many more, for a beggar's staff will no more take us to heaven than a golden chain or velvet fur will take us to hell. Christ says not; "Ye cannot have God and mammon," but "Ye cannot *serve* God and mammon." Riches, says Augustine, are gifts of God and therefore good in themselves. Lest men decry them as evil, they are also accorded to the good, lest they be valued as the best goods, they are also given to the evil; Holy Scripture therefore only forbids men to be proud of and to ground their hopes on uncertain riches. But although riches and righteousness are compatible with one other, yet those who are distinguished by their worldly possessions, should cherish in their souls a sacred fear of them.—Riches are snares [German rhyme "*Schätze sind Netze.*"—M.].—A man lights hell-fire with his own hands if he suffers the fire of lusts to burn in his heart.—Dr. Sauvergne, a physician, narrates the case of a miser, who had his money brought to his dying bed and expired with the words "more gold, more gold!"

LISCO:—The dangers of wealth.—Of twofold riches (earthly and heavenly).—

PORUBSZKY:—The woe uttered over the rich. 1, what it means; 2, its application to our time, 3, when it will cease.

[WORDSWORTH: v. 2.—Although they may still glitter brightly in *your* eyes, and may dazzle men by their brilliance when ye walk the streets, or sit in the high places of this world; yet they are in fact *already* cankered. They are loathsome in *God's sight*. The Divine anger has breathed on them and blighted them; they are already withered and blasted, as being doomed to speedy destruction; for ye *lived delicately on the earth* (v. 5), and have not laid up treasure in *heaven*, where neither *moth* nor *rust* doth corrupt (Matth. vi. 20).

Even while shining in your coffers, they are, in God's eye, sullied and corroded, and they will not profit you in the day of trial, but be consumed by His indignation: and the rust they have contracted by lying idle as κτήματα, and not being used as χρήματα, will be a *witness against* you at the Great Day; and will pass from them by a plague-like contagion and *devour your flesh as fire.*

v. 5.—A striking contrast. Ye feasted jovially in a day of sacrifice, when abundance of flesh of the sacrificed animals is on the table at the sacrificial banquet. Ye ought to have ruled the people gently and mildly; but ye "have fed yourselves and not the flock," ye *nourished* your *own hearts* and not those of your people; ye have sacrificed and devoured them like sheep or calves of the stall fatted for the pampering of your own appetites. Cf. Ezek. xxxiv. 1–10. Cyril *in Caten.* p. 33.

Ye did this at the very time when ye yourselves were like victims appointed to be sacrificed in the day of the Lord's vengeance, which is often compared by Hebrew prophets to a sacrifice, see below, Rev. xix. 17. Cf. Oecumenius and Theophylact here.

This was signally verified by the event. The Jews from all parts of the world came together to the *sacrifice* of the *Passover* A. D. 70, and they themselves were then *slain as victims* to God's offended justice, especially in the *Temple;* particularly was this true of the *rich*, as recorded by Josephus, *B. J.* vi. *passim.*—Their wealth excited the cupidity and provoked the fury of the factious zealots against them, and they fell victims in a day of slaughter to their own love of mammon; what was left of their substance was consumed by the flames, which burnt the city.—Joseph. *B. J.* VII. 29, 32, 37.—M.].

X. FINAL THEME AND CONCLUSION.

FURTHER ADDRESS TO THE BRETHREN. FINAL THEME: EXHORTATION TO ENDURANCE IN LONG-SUFFERING PATIENCE UNTO THE COMING OF THE LORD.—ENCOURAGEMENT THERETO. CONDITION THEREOF. FINAL PROMISE.

CHAPTER V. 7–20.

7 Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the hus-
bandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it,
8 until he receive the early[1] and latter rain. Be ye also patient;[2] establish your hearts:
9 for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren,[3]
10 lest ye be condemned:[4] behold, the[5] judge standeth before the door. Take, my[6] bre-
thren,[7] the prophets, who have spoken in[8] the name of the Lord, for an example of
11 suffering affliction,[9] and of patience. Behold, we count them happy which endure.[10]
Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen[11] the end of the Lord; that the
12 Lord[12] is very pitiful, and of tender mercy. But above all things,[13] my brethren,
swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath: but
13 let[14] your yea be yea; and *your* nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation.[15] Is any

14 among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms. Is any sick
among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him,
15 anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord:[16] And the prayer of faith shall save
the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall
16 be forgiven him. Confess[17] *your* faults[18] one to another, and pray [19] one for another,
that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth
17 much. Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed ear-
nestly that it might not rain: and it rained not on the earth by the space of three
18 years and six months. And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain,[20] and the
19 earth brought forth her fruit. Brethren,[21] if any of you do err from the truth,[22] and
20 one convert him; Let him know[23] that he which converteth the sinner from the error
of his way shall save a soul[24] from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.[25]

Verse 7. [1 Rec. A. K. L. al. insert ὑέτον before πρώϊμον; Cod. Sin. inserts τόν καρπόν (τόν improb.) before πρώϊμον.—M.]
Lange: Be patient therefore [endure], brethren, ... having patience with reference to it, till it hath received the early and the latter rain.
[.... being patient over (Alford) it, untill it shall have received .... —M.]

Verse 8. [2 Cod. Sin. L. al. insert οὖν after μακροθυμήσατε.—M.]
Lange: .... strengthen your hearts, for the coming of the Lord is nigh.
[.... stablish ...., because the coming .... —M.]

Verse 9. 3 A. B. Lachm. Tischend. place ἀδελφοί before ἀλλήλων. [Cod. Sin. κατὰ ἀλλήλων.—M.]
4 A. B. K. L. [Cod. Sin.—M]. al. read κριθῆτε for κατακριθῆτε.
5 Rec. omits not ὁ κριτής (as Huther asserts), but ὁ sustained by A. B. K. L. [Cod. Sin.—M.] al.
Lange: Groan (sigh) not .... that ye be not judged .... before the doors.
[Murmur not, brethren, ... that ye be not judged .... —M.]

Verse 10. 6 7 Rec. K. L. al. insert μου before ἀδελφοί, omit A. B.—Rec. has τῆς κακοπαθείας before ἀδελφοί but A. B. K. L. al give ἀδελφοί first.
8 ἐν found in B [Cod. Sin.—M.], adopted by Lachmann, is wanting in A. G. K. al.
[9 Cod. Sin. reads καλοκαγαθίας for κακοπαθείας.—M.]
Lange: Take, brethren, as an example of suffering evil and of patience the prophets who have spoken in virtue of the name of the Lord.
[Take, my brethren, ... of affliction and patience ...., who spoke in .... —M.]

Verse 11. 10 Lachmann for ὑπυμένοντας reads ὑπομείναντας A. B. Vulg. al. Cod Sin. ὑπομίναντας.
11 ἴδετε A. B. G. al. Tischend. [Alford], through an exegetical mistake appears to have been changed into εἴδετε Rec. B al. and adopted by Lachmann.
12 ὁ κύριος omit G. K. al. Tischendorf; A. B. insert it, but B omits the Article. This ὁ κύριος was probably omitted, because it was held to be superfluous after the preceding κυρίου (Huther).
Lange: Behold, we count happy the sufferers who did endure.—Ye have heard of the endurance of Job and look at the end [the consummation] of the Lord. For very compassionate is the Lord and merciful.
[Behold, we count happy them that endure .... See also the end of the Lord [of His dealings with him]: because the Lord is very pitiful and merciful.—M.]

Verse 12. [13 Cod. Sin. has πάντων οὖν.—M.]
[14 Cod. Sin. reads ἤτω δὲ ὁ λόγος for ἤτω δὲ Rec.—M.]
[15 Luther's rendering "into hypocrisy" arose from the less authentic reading εἰς ὑπόκρισιν Rec. G. K. al. But A. B. Vulg. al. fix the reading ὑπὸ κρίσιν.
Lange: But above all things, my brethren, swear (conspire) not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth .....But let your (Sinait.: ὁ λόγος) yea be a yea, and your nay a nay, that ye fall not under judgment.
[.... that ye fall not under judgment.—M.]

Verse 13. Lange: Does affliction happen to any among you? ...., is any cheerful, let him sing praise.
[Is any among you in affliction? .... Is any cheerful? .... —.M]

Verse 14. [16 Insert τοῦ before κυρίου Rec. K. L. omits B, which also omits κυρίου.—M.]
Lange: .... let him call to himself ....
[.... let him call for .... —M.]

Verse 15. Lange: And the prayer of faith shall help the sick .... it shall be forgiven him.
[.... save (heal) the sick man; .... M.]

Verse 16. 17 A. B. K. [Cod. Sin.—M.] Vulg. al. Lachmann [Alford] insert οὖν. [Rec. omits it.—M.]
18 τὰς ἁμαρτίας A. B. [Cod. Sin.—M.] al. Lachmann; τὰ παραπτώματα G. K. al. Tischendorf [Alford.—M.]
19 A. B. προσεύχεσθε; [Rec. εὔχεσθε.—M.]
Lange: Confess, therefore, your sins to one another, and pray for one another .... The prayer of a righteous man, inwardly effectual [efficiency effected] availeth much.
[.... therefore your transgressions one to another .... The inwardly effectual prayer of a righteous man is very efficacious.—M.]

Verse 17. Lange: .....of like passions with us, and he prayed a prayer that it should not rain, and it did not rain in the land for ....
[.... of like passions with us, and he prayed with prayer that it might not rain, and it rained not on the earth for .... —M.]

Verse 18. [20 ἔδωκεν τὸν ὑετόν Cod. Sin. A. al.—M.]

Verse 19. 21 Rec. G. Tischend. omit μου. A. B. K. [Cod. Sin.—M.] insert it; so Lachmann [Alford.—M.]
[22 Cod. Sin. inserts τῆς ὁδοῦ before τῆς ἀληθείας.—M.]
Lange: My brethren, if any among you should have strayed from the truth, [Sinait.: from the way of the truth] and one should convert him ....
[.... be led astray from the truth and one turn him back.—M.]

Verse 20. [23 γινωσκέτω Rec. A. K. L. Vulg. al.; γινώσκετε B. Alford.—M.]
24 ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. A. [Cod. Sin.—M.] Vulg. al. Lachmann, [A inserts τήν—M.]; Rec. B. G. K. al. read ψυχήν.
Lange: Let him know .... cover a multitude of sins.
[Know ye, that he who turneth a sinner from the error of his way .... —M.]
25 The subscriptions: of James, Epistle of James; Epistle of St. James.

[Ιακωβου B; Ιακωβου επιστολη, A; τελος του αγιου αποστολου Ιακωβου επιστολη καθολικη Z.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Analysis:—Further address to the brethren. Final theme, viz: exhortation to endurance in long-suffering patience unto the coming of the Lord, vv. 7-9. Encouragement thereto: Examples of patient suffering, vv. 10, 11.—Conditions thereof: Shunning of seditious movements. A hallowed disposition. The healing of their sicknesses. Liberation of the conscience by means of confession of sins. Exhortation to intercession. The example of Elias, vv. 12-18.—Conclusion replete with promise, vv. 19, 20.

Further address to the brethren. Final theme: viz. exhortation to endurance in long-suffering patience unto the coming of the Lord, vv. 7, 8.

Ver. 7. **Be patient therefore, brethren.**—ἀδελφοί is the turning-point in the Apostle's address. He now turns primarily to the Christian section of his readers without excluding however the further design of the address for all Jews capable of conversion in contrast to the aforementioned incorrigible πλούσιοι. μακροθυμεῖν literally to have great courage, to be magnanimous, branches out into the ideas to be long-suffering or forbearing towards the erring, applicable both to Divine and human long-suffering, and to be patient in the endurance of suffering, but also with the lateral idea of patiently hoping for endurance under apparent danger, *here* under the experience of worldly and human wrong, Heb. vi. 12. Hence μακροθυμία is distinguished from ὑπομονή in Col. i. 11. And here also the term is obviously chosen instead of ὑπομένειν ch. i. 12, because the Apostle desires to lay stress on the endurance of the Jewish-Christian under the wrongs of the old situation of the world, by which the Judaists suffered themselves to be drifted into revolution.

Unto the coming of the Lord.—The Lord is Christ, as in ch, ii. 1, and the παρουσία denotes His eschatological advent according to the entire evangelical and apostolical system of doctrine (consequently not the coming of God unto judgment distinct and separate from the advent of Christ, as held by Augusti, Theile, de Wette). But this involves no reason for identifying this παρουσία with the judgments announced in v. 1. nor must we, on the other hand, limit the coming of Christ to the last and concluding event of His epiphany. The coming of Christ is the epiphany (manifestation) of Christ with all its antecedent interpositions, be they universal or individual, the greatest of which is the destruction of Jerusalem, as the type of all subsequent comings.

Behold the husbandman waiteth.—Cf. ch. iii. 18; Sir. vi. 16; 2 Tim. ii. 6.

For the precious fruit of the earth.—Which is well worth waiting for. In this the husbandman is a symbol for believers, as also in that he confides the seed to the earth, to invisibleness, to seeming death and the grave. Jno. xii. 24.—

Being patient over it.—μακροθυμεῖν probably denotes here his persevering hope of the seemingly buried seed. It is the preciousness of the fruit (which, although invisible, he sees in expectation), that gives him long-enduring, faith-like courage. He calculates on it. [ἐπί is very graphic; it depicts him, as it were, sitting over it in the confident expectation of its appearing. —M.].

Until it shall have received.—That is, the fruit in its seed, not the husbandman (Morus).

The early and the latter rain.—That is with reference to the climate of Palestine: the autumnal rain before sowing, the spring rain before harvest, Deut. xi. 14, 2; Jer. v. 24, etc. See Winer, R. W. B. Article "*Witterung*." [The early rain πρώϊμος מוֹרֶה יוֹרֶה began to fall about the middle of October, became more continuous in November and December and turned into snow in January and February. The latter rain ὄψιμος, מַלְקוֹשׁ fell in March and lasted to about the middle of April. Thunder-gusts were not uncommon from January to March.—The singular exposition of the early and the latter rain given by Oecumenius may prove suggestive: πρώϊμος ὑετός, ἡ ἐν νεότητι μετὰ δακρύων μετάνοια. ὄψιμος, ἡ ἐν τῇ γήρᾳ.—M.].

Ver. 8. **Be ye also patient.**—As is the husbandman. It is assumed that the seed has been sown among them. Their patience, indeed, is sorely tried, hence:

Establish your hearts.—1 Thess. iii. 13; 1 Pet. v. 10. It is here understood that this must be done by seeking refuge in prayer to the Lord, who giveth strength, as has been repeatedly pointed out, ch. i. 5, 6 etc.

Because the coming of the Lord is nigh.—Literally: it has already drawn nigh in its coming nigh. It is not a fixed nearness but a constant drawing nearer and that, not in the sense of a chronological definition, but in the sense of a religious expectation and assurance, which does not calculate the time and the hour, or rather looks at time in the spirit of the Lord before whom a thousand years are as one day (2 Pet. iii. 8). In the Apostle's sense of the expression, it could be said and may be said at all times: the coming of the Lord is nigh.

Ver. 9. **Murmur not, brethren, against one another.**—There is no reason why this should be limited to the mutual forbearance among "Christians" (Huther). Here again all the dissensions among the Jews must be taken into consideration. As James had already denounced their quarrels, so he now feels anxious to stop the very sources of these quarrels. Huther admits that James refers to a "*gemitus accusatorius*" (Estius, Calvin), but denies that it amounts to a "*provocatio ultionis*" (Theile and al.). But the second cannot be separated from the first; the legalism of the Old Testament, moreover, as contrasted with the thorough fidelity of the N. T. intercession, exerted as yet a powerful influence over the minds of the Jewish-Christians and might easily bias them in that direction. The believing Jews were peculiarly exposed to that temptation by the oppressive and irritating treatment they received at the hands of the rich. Huther rightly remarks that impatience in affliction has the tendency of making men irritable. [It is of course difficult to determine whether the reference is to Christians only or to those who were open to conviction, or to all whom it might concern. As the exhortation states a general moral duty, it is

perhaps best to give it the widest possible application. In this sense the note of Hornejus (in Huther) will be found useful: "*Quos ad manifestas et gravissimas improborum injurias fortiter ferendas incitarat, eos nunc hortatur, ut etiam in minoribus illis offensis quæ inter pios ipsos sæpe subnascuntur, vel condonandis vel dissimulandis promti sint. Contingit enim ut qui hostium et improborum maximas sæpe contumelias et injurias æquo animo tolerant, fratrum tamen offensas multo leniores non facile ferant.*"—M.].

That ye be not judged.—According to Matth. vii. 1, because murmuring against one another is also judging. [The reference is to final condemnation.—M.].

Behold, the Judge standeth before the doors.—(Matth. xxiv. 33). *Before the door.* The Judge *i. e.* Christ. Theile sees here a reference to the disposition of the Judge to punish the oppressors and to avenge the oppressed; Huther, on the other hand, says it is intended to caution the suffering against the suspension of love and to hold out to them the promise of speedy deliverance. But it is pretty certain that the love of justice, purified from every unholy admixture, may also expect the just recompense of evil, and that the two ideas, therefore, go together. Wiesinger's remark is excellent: "Ye may with perfect calmness leave the judgment to Him and therefore ye ought not to expose yourselves to the danger of the judgment." Cf. Phil. iv. 5. [Seeing Christ will speedily execute judgment, do not murmur against one another; murmuring against one another is a species of judging and condemning, ye are brethren, not accusers and judges of one another; invading the prerogative of the Judge renders you liable to judgment and condemnation. Love, requite evil with good and leave the judgment in the hands of Christ.—The reader is referred to the Introduction for the remarkable incident recorded by Hegesippus that the religious sects at Jerusalem were wont to ask St. James "which is the *Door* of Jesus?" Wordsworth says: "The words of St. James 'Behold the Judge standeth at the *doors*' perhaps became current among them. Perhaps those words may also have excited the question put in a tone of derision, 'which is the *Door* of Jesus?' at *what* Door is He standing? By *what Door* will He come? Show Him to us and we will go out to meet Him.—This supposition is confirmed by the reply of St. James, 'why do ye ask me concerning the Son of Man? He sitteth in heaven, and *will come* in the clouds of heaven.'"—For other interpretations of that saying "Which is the Door of Jesus?" see Bp. Pearson on St. Ignatius, ad Philadelph. 9, αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς, with reference to Jno. x. 7–9; Valesius and al. on *Euseb.* II. 23; Lardner, *Hist. of Apostles*, ch. 16; Credner, *Einleit.* 2, p. 580; Gieseler, *Church Hist.* § 81; and Delitzsch on *Ep. to the Hebrews*, p. 673.—M.].

Encouragement thereto. Examples of patient suffering. vv. 10, 11.

VER. 10. **Take, my brethren, as an example.**—*ὑπόδειγμα*, example or pattern=*παράδειγμα*, representation, related to *ὑπογραμμός*, writing-copy (copy-head) perhaps also attestation, and *τύπος*, the original pattern or beginning of a thing.

Of affliction and patience.—*κακοπάθεια*, ἅπαξ λεγ. in N. T. although not exactly=to suffer wrong (Hottinger), or=to suffer absolutely, denotes suffering evil or affliction, which easily suggests suffering wrong. [But, as Alford remarks, the word is strictly objective and is found parallel with *ξυμφορά* and the like. Cf. v. 13, Mal. i. 12; 2 Macc. ii. 26, 27; and Thucyd. vii. 77, *ἐλπίδα χρὴ ἔχειν, μηδὲ καταμέμψασθαι ὑμᾶς ἄγαν αὐτούς, μήτε ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς, μήτε ταῖς παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν νῦν κακοπαθείαις* (spoken by Nicias to the suffering Athenian army in Sicily): so Isocr. p. 127. c. *μηδὲ μικρὰν οἴεσθαι δεῖν ὑπενεγκεῖν κακοπάθειαν.*—M.].

The prophets, who spoke in the name of the Lord.—Cf. Matth. v. 12. The addition characterizes them as servants of the Lord, who endured wrong for His sake.—**Who spoke.**—In a pregnant sense as frequently in the prophets.

In the name of the Lord.—(Lange: "in virtue of the name of the Lord"). Huther makes *τῷ*=*ἐν τῷ*, claiming as much for Matth. vii. 22. But there the sense is modified and here also this peculiar expression has probably to be so explained that the name of the Lord, *i. e.* the fundamental thought of the revelation of the Old Testament, gave impulse to their speaking. [But this seems a forced construction and since B. and Cod. Sin. actually supply *ἐν* there is really no reason why *τῷ* should not be taken=*ἐν τῷ.*—M.].

VER. 11. **Behold, we count happy.**—(Matth. v. 10, 11). This saying is not only a subjective judgment of James but a reference to the fixed judgment recognized in the theocratic congregation and more particularly in the Christian Church. On this account also the reading *τοὺς ὑπομείναντας* is preferable to *ὑπομένοντας*. This embraces of course also the prophets just referred to (Grotius etc.), yet not them only but besides them also the most honoured sufferers. Hence we have "ye have heard of the patience of Job," Ez. xiv. 14, 20; Tob. ii. 12–15.—Although his patience was at first shaken by the great temptation, it gradually became established even unto conquering the temptation. The Jewish Christians had heard of him not only by means of the lessons which were read in the synagogue, but the name of Job was popularly honoured among them.

The end of the Lord.—We have here once more James' uniformly significant *τέλος*, the import of which is wholly misunderstood if the passage is made to denote with Huther, Wiesinger and many others: "the termination which the Lord gave" (of the Lord, Genitive of the causal subject). We therefore return confidently to the exposition of Augustine, Bede, Wetstein and al. "the end of the Lord is the completing of Christ." It is objected that the context does not warrant such a construction. But the context speaks in the Plural, not in the Singular of those who did suffer. The final clause of the verse "for very compassionate is the Lord and merciful," it is supposed, ought to be restricted to the mercy of God, which gave so happy a termination to the sufferings of Job. But was Job's restitution, according to the idea of the book, merely an act

of mercy? On the other hand the supposition that Christ the Lord, pursuant to His compassion, entered upon His passion and thus showed the endurance of patience, conforms exactly to the biblical idea (1 Pet. ii. 21; iv. 1; Heb. ii. 10), and this idea is actually prefigured in the book of Daniel (ch. iii. 25). Huther, moreover, thinks it improbable, that James should have connected the example of Christ immediately with that of Job. But he did thus connect the example of Abraham with that of Rahab. There the antithesis was: Abraham, the father of believing Jews, Rahab a degraded Gentile woman; the antithesis here is: the great sufferer of the Old Testament, the Great Sufferer of the New. This abandonment of the ancient interpretation of our passage we cannot regard otherwise than as a consequence of the disparaging views held with respect to this Epistle. Besides James could hardly extol to the Jewish Christians the glorious gain of patience in suffering without adverting also to the example of Christ (cf. 1 Pet. ii. 21 etc.). This might have struck some of his readers as almost amounting to a denial. And why does he employ the term τέλος, by which he understands principial completion, and generally that of the New Testament? Why does the verb ἠκούσατε not suffice him and why does he in contrast with it, use the Imperative ἴδετε "look at the completion of the Lord?" But the Lord, like Job, went through suffering to glory, and that in the highest sense; and He was moved thereto by His infinite compassion, His love, which is also designed to coöperate with the patience of Christians. And this ἴδετε seems to be the culminating point of the Apostle's missionary saying addressed to those Jews who were as yet unbelieving: "the end of the Lord, look at it;" while the common exposition: "The end, which the Lord gave, see (*i. e.* know, learn from it) that the Lord is πολύσπλαγχνος etc." (Huther), is not only very flat, but also forced.—*For very pitiful is the Lord.* Rendering ὅτι *for*, appears to Huther unsubstantiated by what goes before, but nothing can be more simple than the thought: "look at the end of the sufferings of Christ, for that He suffered need not excite astonishment, it is a consequence of His pity. πολύσπλαγχνος occurs here only; it is formed after רַב חֶסֶד (Wiesinger), the LXX use instead πολυέλεος, Paul and Peter εὔσπλαγχνος (Eph. iv. 32; 1 Pet. iii. 8).

Conditions of this patience. Shunning of seditious movements. A hallowed disposition. The healing of their sicknesses. Liberation of the conscience by means of confession of sins. Exhortation to intercession. The example of Elias. vv. 12–18.

VER. 12. **But before all things, my brethren, do not swear (conspire).**—We cannot admit the view of Kern and Wiesinger that the connection of the Epistle breaks off at this point or that the dehortation contained in this verse has no other connection with what goes before than that which arises from the conduct of the readers.* The fundamental idea which connects this verse with v. 11 and v. 13 etc., is the allaying of the fanatical excitement which was constantly growing among the Jews and was threatening through the influence of the Judaists to deprive the Jewish Christian Churches of their Christian composure. The history of the banding together of more than forty men against the life of St. Paul (Acts xxiii. 12–21) proves the bias of judaistic zealots to enter into conspiracies; subsequently towards the outbreak of the Jewish war they were doubtless of more frequent occurrence. We have employed in our translation an ambiguous word [*Verschwörung*, of which we have no current equivalent in English, *i. e.* an *ambiguous* equivalent; the German words denotes 1, to bind oneself by an oath; 2, to enter into a conspiracy. *Conjuration* is the nearest English representative of *Verschwörung*, but the sense of *conspiracy* attached to it, although current in the days of Sir Thomas Elyot (+1546), is now obsolete.—M], in order to intimate this meaning. To be sure we take it textually in the sense that all swearing accompanied by hypothetical imprecations or the giving of a pledge is conspiracy. See Comm. on St. Matth. v. 34 etc. Hence James, like Christ (Matth. v. 34), defines this swearing as swearing by heaven, by the earth, or by any other oath (ὅρκος) connected with a hypothetical curse. The Greek construction ὀμνύειν with the Accusative brings out the unseemly character of such swearing by or appeal to a created object as a witness or avenger, with greater distinctness than the Hebrew construction of the same verb with ἐν. Oecumenius, de Wette, Neander, and al. understand the prohibition to apply to swearing in general, as in Matth. v. 33 with reference to or for the ideal condition of the Church. On the other hand Calvin, Wiesinger and many others refer the prohibition to light and trifling oaths in common life. With this must be connected the remark of Huther that swearing by the name of God is not mentioned; had he intended this swearing, he ought to have mentioned it in express terms because it is not only commanded in the law in contradistinction to other oaths (Deut. vi. 13; x. 20; Ps. lxiii. 12), but also foretold in the prophets as a token of men's future conversion to God (Is. lxv. 16; Jer. xii. 16; xxiii. 7, 8). But it follows also from this contradistinction that the oath in virtue of its N. T. completion was designed to be stripped of the formulæ of cursing and imprecation which always involve the pledging of things over which man has no control. To be sure, the stress lies here not only on this idealizing of the oath but also on the total setting aside of the abuse of oaths in the reality of social life. This attitude of James respecting abitrary oaths and his recommendation of the anointing with oil mentioned in the sequel, show that he was free from all Essene prejudice, for the Essenes were wont to administer to novices the vow of their order with a strong oath, although they rejected all other swearing, and so in like manner the anointing with oil.

But let your yea be yea.—[Winer: *Grammar*, p. 92, the Imperative ἤτω for ἔστω (which in the N. T. is also the usual form) 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Jas. v. 12; (Ps. civ. 31; 1 Macc. x. 31, cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 6, 275; *Acta Thom.* 8, 7), Buttman I. 529; only once in Plato, *Rep.* 2, 361,

* On the attempt of Rauch to prove the non-authenticity of the section ch. v 12–20, see Gebser, p. 395.

d. See Schneidel p. 1. According to Heraclides (in *Eustath.* p. 1411, 22), the flexion is Doric. The other imper. form ἴσθι occurs in Matth. ii. 13; v. 25; Mark v. 34; Luke xix. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 15 (Buttmann I. 257).—M.]. The exhortation corresponding to the prohibition. Here we find two opposing interpretations; 1. Let your yea *and* nay agree with your consciousness of positive or negative facts, *i. e.* let it be according to truth (Theophylact, Calvin and al.); 2. Let your yea be a simple yea, your nay a simple nay (Estius, Neander, Huther). We think that the two ought to be connected together from the nature of the case (see Comm. on Matth. v. 34 etc.), but that the choice of the expression in Matthew along with actual truthfulness gives prominence to the assurance, while here James rather intones the perfect composure whereby the soul contents itself with the simple declaration.

That ye fall not under judgment.—On the reading εἰς ὑπόκρισιν see Appar. Crit.; on the expression see 2 Sam. xxii. 39; Ps. xviii. 39. The context requires a judgment of condemnation and this is to be dreaded not only on account of the formal, wicked carelessness with which such oaths are uttered (which carelessness moreover leads to hypocrisy) but also on account of the mutinous and perilous acts or steps by which they are frequently sealed.

Ver. 13. **Is any among you in affliction?**—In opposition to the reprehensible sealing of excited frames of mind by such imprecatory swearing, the Apostle exhorts them to calmness of disposition and points out the means of accomplishing it. Its way was under all circumstances by a religious elevation of the mind. In the case of affliction (for the rendering: "does any among you suffer?" strikes us as too weak) the depression of the mind is to be raised by prayer; in the case of prosperity the mind is to be guarded against wantonness by the sacrifice of prosperity, by thanksgiving, by the singing of psalms or songs of praise (ψάλλειν 1 Cor. xiv. 15). Cf. ch. i. 9, 10. Huther thinks that the connection of this exhortation with the one preceding it cannot be substantiated. The connection is manifestly the Christian regulation of different mental conditions.

Ver. 14. **Is any sick among you?**—Here is the culminating point of the question whether the language of James is to be uniformly taken in a literal sense, or whether it uniformly bears a figurative character. The literal construction involves these surprising moments: 1. The calling for the presbyters of the congregation in the Plural; 2. the general direction concerning their prayer accompaning unction with oil; 3. and especially the confident promise that the prayer of faith shall restore the sick apart from his restoration being connected with the forgiveness of his sins. Was the Apostle warranted to promise bodily recovery in every case in which a sick individual complied with his directions? This misgiving urges us to adopt the symbolical construction of the passage, which would be as follows: if any man as a Christian has been hurt or become sick in his Christianity, let him seek healing from the presbyters, the kernel of the congregation. Let these pray with and for him and anoint him with the oil of the Spirit; such a course wherever taken, will surely restore him and his transgressions will be forgiven him. This symbol, explained in the Epistles of Ignatius as containing the direction that the bishop, the centre of the congregation should be called in, may be founded on a wide-spread Jewish Christian custom of healing the wounds of the sick by prayer accompanying the application with oil. Most remote from the mind of the Apostle is the Roman Catholic tradition of extreme unction; for the reference here is to the healing of the wounds of the sick conducing to their recovery, but not to a ritual preparation of him for death; not any more here than in Mark vi. 13. Cf. Huther's note, p. 196.

Let him call to himself (summon, call for).—In the case of bodily sickness it is self-evident that this must be done by others than the sick man. [προσκαλεσάσθω does not necessarily mean that the sick man is to call in person on the elders of the Church, it leaves the manner of his appeal undefined, he might call on them in person or *summon* them to his side by the intervention of others. To summon in the sense of sending for seems to be the most approved meaning. Cf. the Lexica.—M.].

The elders of the Church.—We must neither reduce the Plural to the Singular in the sense: "let him summon one of the presbyters" (Estius, Wolf), nor assert confidently that ἐκκλησία denotes here the particular congregation to which the sick man belongs, although the latter is probable. The main point is that ἡ ἐκκλησία, as a local congregation did represent from the beginning the whole Church and that consequently the presbyters could be sent for primarily from the most specific ecclesiastical district but also from a more distant sphere. [If I understand Lange's allusion, I doubt whether his inference is sustained by the facts of the case. *Interloping* was not sanctioned in the primitive Church. The Apostles uniformly insist upon order and decency in the conduct of Church government. A sick man, connected with a particular ecclesiastical organization would send, of course, for the presbyters connected with it; where no such organization existed, he would send for those presbyters to whom access might most easily be had.—M.].

And let them pray over him; *i. e.* not only for him, nor only literally as standing over his bed, but with reference to effecting his salvation (Acts xix. 18). [Bengel: "*Qui dum orant, non multo minus est quam si tota oraret ecclesia.*"—M.].

Anointing him with oil.—Many commentators assume, with reference to the Jewish custom, that the oil was here intended to coöperate as a medium of cure, cf. Jer. 8, 22; xlvi. 11; Luke x. 34. The disciples also used to connect this medium with their miraculous cures, Mark vi. 13. See this Comment. in loco. Now in so far as the reference here implied lies to an apostolical method of effecting cures, we must doubtless think also of the organic connection of intercession with oil, *i. e.* of the spiritual effect accompanying that produced on the medium of the body. Huther (in opposition to Meyer) dissolves this connection without sufficient reason, by observing that the oil as such was only refresh-

ing to the body. What such a refreshing amounts to, is not very clear; the chief point is that the two were to be united in one act, which was performed in the *name of the Lord* (Christ). But Huther rightly remarks that James did not prescribe anointing, but assumed the observance of the usage. He prescribes prayer in connection with that usage and the anointing as an anointing in the name of the Lord, which latter particular must not be referred to prayer only (Gebser), nor to both acts (de Wette), but solely to the act of anointing (Huther). In the literal acceptation of the precept, prayer would be the medium of the miraculous cure, which was then to be performed in the name of the Lord (*i. e.* not pursuant to His command, but in the power and limitation of His name). Schneckenburger adds that the presbyters had the *χάρισμα ἰαμάτων* (1 Cor. xii. 9). Huther calls this an arbitrary assumption and says that moreover nothing is said here of the *χάρισμα*. But the *χάρισμα* has at all times been the *conditio sine qua non* of ministerial efficiency and in the Apostolical church the office of presbyter did not involve the charisma, but rather those who had the respective charisma were generally ordained as presbyters (see 1 Cor. xii. 9, 30). Huther also sets aside without sufficient reason the connection between miraculous gifts and gifts of natural experience to which Pott, after his manner, calls attention: "*quia uti omnino prudentissimi eligebantur, sic forte etiam artis medicæ peritissimi erant.*

VER. 15. **And the prayer of faith.**—Not faith in general, but miraculous faith as a special charisma of the Christian spirit (see 1 Cor. xii. 9, 10). Prayer characterized by such faith, not in general: the prayer which faith offers. Grotius and al. rightly assume that this faith implies identity of purpose on the part of the presbyters who intercede, and on that of the sick for whom intercession is made, for it is in this faith that the sick summons the presbyters (cf. the Gospels); Wiesinger and Huther arbitrarily limit this prayer to the act of the presbyters only.

Shall help (heal) the sick.—Shall savingly restore him to health. Lyra, Schneckenburger and al. understand corporeal and spiritual healing, de Wette, Wiesinger and al. corporeal only, because the forgiveness of sins is separately stated afterwards [Alford—M.]. Nevertheless we feel that we cannot give up the oneness of the two moments, seeing that the sequel doubtless adverts to the possibility of particular sins and that, as already stated, the concrete apostolical *spiritual-corporeal* cure seems to be here uniformly the symbol of a spiritual-social cure of the wounds and infection of the judaistic confusion.

And the Lord shall raise him up.—The Lord *i. e.* Christ. As is His wont to raise men spiritually-bodily, not only from the bed of sickness but also from the sickness. This *ἐγείρειν* however is not only the causality of the preceding *σώζειν*, but also holds out the prospect of the positive exaltation of life which has been effected by the *σώζειν* as the deliverance from peril of death.

And though he have committed sins.—This denotes an enhanced state of distress. Supposing that he even (*κἂν*) have committed sins, as *πεποιηκώς*, as one who is as yet burdened with the guilt of those sins (Plural). The presumption is not so much that these sins were the cause of the respective sickness (Huther), but they made the sickness a severe one and one difficult to cure; this would again import a spiritual meaning.

It shall be forgiven him; that is, his having committed sins. "Even in case that." (Huther.) Forgiven not only in the social sense (*i. e.* by the presbyters (Hammond), not only in respect of his spiritual life, but the continuation, the curse of his guilt shall also be removed in respect of his life-situation. Huther wants to connect *κἂν* with the preceding clause: "The Lord shall raise him up, even if he have committed sins—(for) it shall be forgiven him." In point of language *κἂν* is to favour his construction (but see on the other hand 1 Jno. ii. 1); but in point of matter such a construction would greatly weaken the passage. The general and unconditional character of the assurance of renewed health, which is here expressed, has created much surprise. Hottinger expresses it more forcibly than any other commentator: "*si certus et constans talium precum fuisset eventus, nemo unquam mortuus esset.*" Grotius supplies the condition: "*nisi nempe aliter ei suppeditat ad salutem æternam.*" But Huther maintains against Wiesinger that there is no need of any restrictions and believes that the difficulty is removed by the consideration that James conceived the coming of Christ to be immediately impending; that consequently he did not consider the death of believers to be necessary, but viewed it only in the light of an evil which might be averted by believing intercession. Thus a second gross error would have paralyzed or covered the first. We rather opine that this very difficulty, as well as the whole character of the Epistle constrains us to adopt the symbolical interpretation. James assumes the existence of the custom of anointing the sick accompanied with prayer as a method of cure very generally prevalent in Jewish Christian Churches. This custom, traces of which are also found in ancient Judaism (see Wiesinger, p. 204*), he now turns into a symbol of a spiritual cure, which he recommends to those who were infected with the spirit of Judaism and revolutionary Chiliasm, as a remedy for their spiritual healing. This construction is also favoured by the next verse. [As the reasoning of Lange may not appear conclusive but rather doubtful to many readers of this work, I subjoin an outline of the subject which may prove valuable for reference.—The opinion of Polycarp, Bp. of Smyrna, a disciple of John and a martyr, is very valuable and sheds light on the whole question. He says (*ad Philipp.* c. 5), "Let the

* Oil in the East, where it is much better than with us, is a common and very useful remedy employed in many diseases by rubbing it into the affected parts and pouring it into wounds for the purpose of mollifying them. Cf. Is. i. 6; Mark vi. 13; Luke x. 34: Joseph. *de bello jud.* 1, 33, 5. The balm of Gilead in particular was highly esteemed as an external application. Jer. viii. 22; xlvi. 11. Thus the Greek and Roman physicians also recommend poultices made of wine and oil, or vinegar and oil (Galen, *de comp. medic.* 2; Plin. *H. N.* 31, 47 etc.). Tertullian *ad Scapulam* informs us also that Proculus, a Christian, cured the Emperor Severus with oil. Cf. also Shevilth 8: *qui capite dolet, aut quem invasit scabies, unguat se oleo etc.* Gebser, p. 403.

presbyters be tender-hearted, merciful to all, converting the erring (see James v. 19), *visiting all who are sick* (ἐπισκεπτόμενοι πάντας ἀσθενεῖς); not neglecting *the widow or orphan or needy*.(see Jas. i. 27), and providing always what is good in *the sight of God*, abstaining from *all respect of persons* (see James ii. 1, 9), not sharp in judgment, knowing that *we are all sinners*" (see James iii. 2). The reference to James in brackets warrants the presumption that Polycarp was familiar with our Epistle, and the extract shows that at that early day the duty of visiting the sick had been devolved on the *presbyters*.—The direction that the sick should summon the presbyters (*Plural*) accords with the practice of our Lord who sent forth His Twelve Apostles and seventy disciples *two* and *two* (Mark vi. 7; Luke x. 1).—The direction would hardly have been given, if it could not be complied with. James, as bishop of Jerusalem, presided over elders *there* (Acts xxi. 18) and his language warrants the conclusion that *presbyters* had been ordained in the principal cities.—Without discussing the question who these presbyters were, the second order of the ministry or the first, the great fact remains that the visitation of the sick is an important part of ministerial activity, and that it is the duty of the *sick* (whether in body or in soul) to summon their spiritual advisers to their side. This is an important consideration, for in large parishes and especially in large cities weeks may sometimes elapse before the report of a parishioner's sickness reaches their ears; if the sick are not visited under those circumstances, they must not blame their minister for remissness if they have failed to inform him of their sickness and to summon him to their side.

Our passage establishes the fact that anointing the sick with prayer accompanying it was practised in the Apostolic Church. The Apostles in virtue of the extraordinary and miraculous powers delegated to them by Christ, healed many, after having anointed them with oil. Cf. Acts vi. 13 with Matth. x. 1–8 and Luke ix. 1–6. The miraculous gift of healing continued for some time in the Church. See 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9. James refers to this *miraculous* power of healing, which in its application however was not absolute, but dependent on the will of God; although applied in faith by the anointing presbyter and received in faith by the sick man, *anointing* did not heal him if he recovered his health, but prayer charged with faith, and this implies that the matter of the sick man's cure was referred to the will of God, who did *what was best for the sick*, (Wordsworth), whether that was restoration to health or a Christian death.

The practice of anointing with oil with a view to recovery from sickness was continued in the Eastern and Western Churches, even after the Church had lost the miraculous gift of healing. It is continued in the Eastern Church for *this purpose* to this day, but the Church of England and other Reformed communions have abandoned the practice, because they perceived that *the effect* mentioned by St. James, viz. his recovery did not ordinarily ensue from the anointing with oil, and that the miraculous gift of healing as well as other miraculous gifts granted to the Apostles, had been removed from the Church.

The Church of Rome however retains the *practice* of anointing the sick with oil but perverted the *design* for which it had been instituted (viz: recovery from sickness), into that of a sacrament conveying grace to the soul, the sacrament of extreme unction, which is certainly one of the most audacious perversions of Scripture on record. See Alford and Wordsworth. Wordsworth: "The Apostle St. James had enjoined the practice with a view to the recovery of the sick; as Cardinal Cajetanus allows, in his note on the passage, where he says: "Hæc verba non loquuntur de Sacramentali unctione *extremæ unctionis*," but the Church of Rome prescribes, in the Councils of Florence (A.D. 1488) and Trent (1551), that the anointing should *not* take place *except* where recovery is *not to be looked for* (Council of Trent, Sess. 14, "*qui tam periculose decumbunt ut in exitu vitæ constituti videantur*"), and therefore she calls this anointing "*extreme unction*," and "*sacramentum exeuntium*," and she regards it as a sacrament conveying grace to the soul. Thus, on the one hand, the Greek Church is a witness by her present practice, that the anointing was designed with a view to *bodily recovery;* and the Roman Church, on the other hand, is a witness, that the *miraculous* effects on the *body*, which were wrought in primitive times through the instrumentality of those who anointed the sick, and which accompanied that unction, *have ceased*."—See this whole subject discussed in my article "*An account of Extreme Unction*," Princeton Review, Vol. XXXVII. No. 2, April, 1865.—M.].

VER. 16. **Confess therefore your sins (transgressions) to one another.**—This injunction is general: it is the generalization of the preceding sentence. Cajetanus rightly observes: "*nec hic est sermo de confessione sacramentali;*" but the clause implies also the fact that James knew nothing of such a *confessio*, or he would have said: "Confess your sins to the presbyters," of whom he had just been speaking. As to the sins here referred to, Huther understands sins in general as violation of the Divine law, in opposition to Wolf, who explains them as offences against one another, Matth. xviii. 15. Bengel: "*Ægrotus et quisquis offendit, jubetur confiteri; offensus, orare.*" But the particular sins which are meant here, at least primarily, may be gathered from the whole Epistle; the reference is to the whole Judaistic movement which in so many respects had made them sick and feeble. But the thought has also the more general import that the confession of certain known transgressions is at once an unburdening of the conscience and a furtherance of prayer in the case of those who are thus drawn into the Christian fellow-feeling of guilt and thus also the preliminary condition both of forgiveness and of spiritual (and often even of bodily) healing. How many a germinating madness and suicide, how many a heart-languor and disorder which vexes the members and weighs down the body was to be obviated by this mutual effect of confession and intercession! But James had more particularly in view the hurts which were then troubling Israel. Both the confession and the intercession were to be mutual.

That ye may be healed.—This healing is understood spiritually by Grotius and al., spiri-

tually and corporeally by Schneckenburger and al., corporeally only by de Wette, Huther and al. As nothing is said here of the forgiveness of sins, the promise of healing implies evidently also spiritual healing: but the idea "that ye may be healed theocratically" is probably predominant. "It is to be remembered that the prayer of the presbyters does not exclude the common intercession of Christians and that the efficacy attributed to the latter is not less than that attributed to the former." Huther. [This is one of the passages adduced by the Latin Church for the necessity of confessing sins to a priest. Alford cites Corn.-a-Lapide's exegesis as a specimen of the way in which the Romish doctrine is deduced. "*Alterutrum, id est, homo homini, similis simili, frater fratri confitemini, puta sacerdoti, qui licet officio sit superior, natura tamen est par, infirmitate similis, obligatione confitendi æqualis.*"—M.].

The prayer . . . . availeth much.—A saying of the power of genuine prayer designed to encourage them to adopt the recommendations previously set forth, *i. e.* both mutual confession of sins and mutual intercession. The great efficacy of such intercession is still further brought about by the position of πολύ etc. and by the gnomic and asyndetical structure of the sentence.

Of a righteous man, of a צַדִּיק in the theocratic sense, *i. e.* not one "in a state of righteousness" as Hofmann expresses it, for "the state of righteousness" denotes an ontological, passive condition, while in the case of the theocratically righteous every thing turns on actuality, on the living faith, on the living God and His word of life. The species of these righteous men is the same in the Old Testament and in the New; they are men of living, energetic faith (Rom. iv), although the righteous man of the New Testament has the advantage of an objective as well as of a subjective τελείωσις. Hence Elias may here be held up to the Christians as the pattern of a real man of prayer.

Inwardly effectual (working).—ἐνεργουμένη causes not little difficulty and has given rise to a great variety of opinions among commentators. A main point to be determined is whether ἐνεργουμένη ought to be taken as an epithet to δέησις, as the majority of commentators take it, or as a pure participial definition of the verb ἰσχύει (so Pott, de Wette, Huther, who are however at variance with respect to the sense). Pott: "Prayer is able to work much" or "prayer is able to work much and worketh much." de Wette: "if it becomes energetic." Huther: "In its energy" or "in its working." But all this is rather tautological unless it be made to denote a theurgic operation, which is inadmissible. The adjectival construction may be taken passively or actively, or in the most literal sense as a middle, as a kind of Hithpael. Prayer may be considered passively as coänimated by the prayer of him for whom it is offered (Oecumenius), as moved by the Holy Spirit, inspired (Michælis), as penetrated by faith (Carpzov), as animated and attended by impulse to work [*Werktrieb*, so Calvin and Gebser]. Taken actively the idea of ἐνεργουμένη coincides more or less with ἐνεργής or ἐνεργός (see Luke xxii. 44 ἐκτενής). So Luther: "if it is earnest;" Vulgate: "*assidua*," and similarly many others. On the other hand, Huther contends that this construction is contrary to N. T. usage, while Wiesinger maintains that this usage may be substantiated and refers to the proofs supplied by Wahl. We believe that the N. T. middle ἐνεργέομαι (Rom. vii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 6; iv. 12; Gal. v. 6; Eph. iii. 20; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7) denotes according to the Hebrew and Christian conception a passivo-active working, *i. e.* a working set in motion by a previously experienced impulse. This *in malam partem* applies to the lusts in the members (Rom. vii. 5), to the mystery of iniquity (2 Thess. ii. 7), *in bonam partem* to the subjective σωτηρία (2 Cor. i. 6), to the subjective πίστις (Gal. v. 6), to the vital energy in believers (Eph. iii. 20), to the energy of Christ in believers (Col. i. 29), to the word of God appropriated by men (1 Thess. ii. 13); in both respects, to death and life (2 Cor. iv. 12). The Active however is used with reference to God Eph. i. 11; Phil. ii. 13; Gal. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 6; of His Spirit 1 Cor. xii. 11; also of Satan Eph. ii. 2. It follows from this clearly marked usage of the word that we must also take δέησις with the predication ἐνεργουμένη as indicating an efficiency effected or an impulse impelled. The idea doubtless imports the full tension of the praying spirit under its absolute obedience (yielding to) to the Divine impulse. And in this respect there is here an allusion to the idea of the miraculously potent prayer which works the ἐνεργήματα. [The Apostle's idea expressed in plain words, seems to be that prayer in order to lead to outward effects, must work inwardly in grateful adoration of and fervent love and humble resignation to God; otherwise prayer is only a hollow, unmeaning and inefficacious uttering of words. Luther in his terse language hits the point, when he says in some place that "he who prays must *feel* that he is a *beggar*." Absolute submission to the will of God is of course the very soul of prayer, and the true Christian never engages in prayer without the pious sentiment: "Not my will, but Thine be done." Wordsworth remarks: "The martyrdom of St. James himself affords a beautiful comment on these words, especially where it is related that after he had been cast down by his enemies from the pediment of the Temple and they were stoning him, he fell on his knees and *prayed* for them, and some, who stood by, said, adopting the very words of this Epistle—"Hold, what do ye? εὔχεται ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὁ δίκαιος," "the *just* man is *praying* for you." See Introduction.—M.].

VER. 17. **Elias was a man of like passions.**—ὁμοιοπαθής does not exactly signify that Elias had the capacity of suffering, or his real sufferings (Laurentius, Schneckenburger), but "of like condition and nature" (Wiesinger and Huther), is hardly adequate in point of sense. In Acts xiv. 15 there is certainly an implied emphasis on the dependence and restraints of human nature as contrasted with the Being of God. Moreover in Wisd. vii. 3 the reference to the earth imports not so much equality of kind as equality of condition. In the case of Elias the term "like passions" or liability to being affected, points at least to his capacity of suffering and temptability.

And he prayed a prayer [with prayer].—Analogous to the Hebrew idiom of producing intensification by placing the Infinitive of the verb in juxtaposition with the Indicative, or by connecting the latter with the noun Gen. ii. 17 מוֹת תָּמוּת. Considering that Huther himself observes that this form serves to bring out the verbal idea, it is difficult to account for his opposition to the exposition of Wiesinger and al., that the prayer of Elias was an earnest prayer. [Huther, I presume, objects to the introduction of a new word. The prayer of Elias was genuine prayer, prayer charged with ἐνέργεια.—M.].

That it might not rain.—βρέχειν is impersonal. [The gen. of the intent. See Winer, p. 343.—M.].

And it did not rain in the land [on the earth].—Considering the O. T. colouring of the whole Epistle we may be allowed to translate ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς with Grotius and al. "in the land," but Huther retains Luther's rendering "on earth," Schneckenburger compares this weighty saying with Gen. i. 3: "*fiat lux et facta est lux.*" But there remains the important difference that here the reference is not to an authoritative command (*Machtspruch*).

[**Three years and six months.**—Wordsworth: equal to 42 months or 1260 days, a chronological period of suffering. See Rev. xi. 8. —M.].

VER. 18. **And the heaven gave rain.**—A personifying, vivid mode of expression, reminding us of the prophetic style, Hos. ii. 21, 22.

And the earth brought forth her fruit. —This was really the immediate purpose of the prayer. βλαστάνω [properly an intransitive verb, but used transitively—M.], a transitive verb: it let spring up, *i. e.* it put, brought forth. An application of what is related 1 Kings xvii. 1; xviii. 1, 42 etc. The positive announcement of the drought may have led James to draw the reasonable inference that Elias had prayed for it, although we have no record to that effect, and tradition had probably anticipated his inference. Such a completion is however very different from a discrepancy (Huther). The second apparent difference is as follows: in 1 Kings xviii. 1, Elijah is said to have foretold and to have been instrumental in bringing about the return of rain in the third year, while our passage affirms that it did not rain on the earth for three years and six months. Seeing that Luke iv. 25 and the tract *Jalcut Simeoni* give the same duration, it would seem that that space of time was the uniform Jewish tradition. The explanation lies manifestly in the fact that 1 Kings xviii. specifies the real famine according to its duration. But it stands to reason that the famine did not begin until one year after the announcement of the drought, viz. after the failure of the early and the latter rain. During the first year the people were still living on the harvest of the preceding year. Jewish tradition consequently added *one* year to the period of time mentioned in a general way in 1 Kings in order to mark the whole period between the two announcements of Elijah. Benson's solution of the difference is somewhat different but not very clear. He says: "*accuratior serioris traditionis computatio, ducitur a tempore non pluviæ primum cessantis, sed ultimum ante siccitatem cadentis, quam dimidio fere anno distare in promptu est.*" That is, the first year of the drought is not added to the famine of about two and a half years' duration, but the half year from the first failure of rain to the last fall of rain immediately preceding. Wiesinger is satisfied with Benson's calculation, but Huther insists upon the discrepancy, because according to the statement of James, the drought began immediately after Elijah's praying. But the narrative itself contains intimations that the drought did not at once produce famine, 1 Kings xvii. 7; ch. xviii. 5. [Benson observes, however, that the words "in the third year" of 1 Kings xviii. 1 do not necessarily refer to the duration of the famine, but most naturally date back to the removal of Elijah to Zarephath, ch. xvii. 8 etc; cf. the same "many days" in ch. xvii. 15, where indeed a variation is "for a full year." Alford. —M.]. But far more important is the question why James selects just this example of an answer to prayer from the history of Israel. The greatest stress seems to lie on his intercession of pity, which was the more edifying as an example because the readers of the Epistle were wont to consider Elijah as a censurer. A drought had for a long time come also upon the spiritual life of Israel; the readers were therefore encouraged to pray with the faith of an Elijah for a rain of grace to fall on their people. The prophet's first prayer is mentioned first, in order to furnish them with a forcible illustration that prayer is heard and answered, and perhaps also to show them how the real men of prayer in Israel were independent of and superior to the evil frame of mind which kept the populace in a ferment. Moreover the general tendency of Elijah's prayers was hostile to the apostasy of Israel, and the zeal of their believing men of prayer was now to be directed against the new apostasy which consisted in an obdurate opposition to the Gospel (see ch. iv. 4; Rom. xi. 1–5).

Conclusion replete with promise. vv. 19, 20.

VER. 19. **My brethren, if any among you should have strayed from the truth.**—"This imports not a single practical aberration, but an alienation from the Christian principle of life, an inward apostasy from the λόγος ἀληθείας, of which the Christian is begotten (ch. i. 18), disclosing itself in a single course of life. Cf. Luke i. 16, 17, v. 20." Huther. But the tenor of the whole Epistle constrains us to define this aberration still further as an aberration into Judaistic and chiliastic doings and fanatico-seditious lusts. [πλανηθῇ is passive and Alford rightly remarks "that there is no reason why the passive signification should not be kept, especially when we remember our Lord's warning, βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ."—M.].

And one should convert him, to the truth, from which he has strayed in peril of apostasy.

VER. 20. **Let him know** [know ye—M.].—He that converts is to know the importance of his action and what a blessing rests upon it. The word, as to its form, is a hypothetical announcement or promise to him who is found thus doing, but as to its contents it is a general sentence or a sententious encouragement to all con-

joined with the promise of a prize to those who act upon it. On this account ἐπιστρέψας is repeated after ὅτι.

That he who converteth a sinner.—The person who has strayed through delusion from the truth, considered from a practical point of view. Let the readers know that all those who have strayed in part or entirely from the truth are sinners according to the emphatic theocratic idea: doomed to the death-ban. This weighty part of the word is weakened by Huther's remark, "that the reference is no longer to the person who has gone astray but to the whole *genus* to which the Christian who has strayed from the truth belongs as *species*." The two ideas: delusion and dogmatical apostasy and practical ruin must not be separated on the theocratical ground, nor must the former kind be subordinated to the latter as *species*, although the practical and the theocratic form of ruin may alternately predominate.

Shall save a soul from death.—From death, as in ch. i. 15 and throughout the New Testament, from subjective damnation as it is inherent in the personality itself, defined moreover negatively with respect to the subject as the loss of the true life, of the true destination and sphere of life; a moral dissolution of the ontological life eternally self-generating itself, as on the other hand the true life generates life. *A soul.* The naked, inward existence of the personality itself, man in all his capacity of suffering and salvation and need of help. He shall *save the soul.* The conversion of the apostate is the conversion of a sinner; this has as its consequence his deliverance from death, because he is in the way of death and is overtaken before he finally falls into the snares of death. We need not stop to show that this presupposes Divine redemption as the salvation to which he is converted and the Divine coöperation of the Word and of the Holy Spirit as the means of salvation whereby he is converted. In the battle of faith between the believing readers of the Epistle and their half-believing and unbelieving brethren the point at issue turns therefore not upon dogmatical disputes of the synagogue, but solely and purely on the salvation of poor souls from eternal death, and not only on this but along with the salvation of many individuals, on the removal of a universal curse.

And shall cover a multitude of sins.—That is, the averting of a general ruin is brought about by the faithful salvation of many individuals. This covering of sins (cf. I Pet. iv. 8; Prov. x. 12) καλύπτειν contains doubtless reference in an enlarged sense, to the Hebrew כָּסָה, *to cover, cover over sins, i. e. to forgive,* Ps. xxxii. 1 and elsewhere. But considering that such absolute covering of sin is the prerogative of God, it is probably better to think here of instrumental covering כִּפֵּר which is also used more especially of different means and mediators of atonement; not only of the cover of the ark, of sacrifice, of the high-priest, but also of the very sins to be atoned for (Ex. xxx. 16: Is. xlvii. 11), and also especially of the person interceding, Ex. xxxii. 30. The last passage strikes us as peculiarly important. Moses effected the reconciliation of his people not as a sacrifice, not as high-priest, but by intercession, *i. e.* by the subjective mediation of the objective atonement. This objective atonement therefore is here assumed, just as the former expression, he shall save, presupposes objective salvation. The believing Jews are to become intercessors for their poor people, become instrumental to bring about its real atonement. Believers participate in the atoning work of Christ as in His sufferings and intercession not as *causa mediatoria* but as *causa organica.* But the commentators are at variance whether the reference here is to the sins of the converters or to those of the converted. Erasmus and al. take it thus: by his good work he shall obtain remission of his sins with God. The Jews held (*Joma* fol. 87): "*quicunque multos ad justitiam adducit, per ejus manus non perpetratur peccatum.*" Augusti: He will obtain forgiveness on the part of men; his own offences will not be remembered. With more reason the majority of commentators refer the words to the sins of the converted. But the reference is not solely to the particular sins of the persons to be converted, and not even to their personal offences. πλῆθος denotes fulness, an entire mass taken as a unit, and the ἁμαρτίαι are the offences requiring to be atoned for. The reference is consequently to the total national guilt of Israel. To be sure, it is not referred to with greater distinctness or more clearly defined than by τὸ πλῆθος, because James, according to ch. v. 1, could no longer hope for the immediate salvation of all Israel, but foresaw, like Paul, a great judgment on their obduracy. But it was still his duty pitifully to wrestle with the judgment and to save a fulness (multitude) of souls and to atone for their sins. But whereas a common, national guilt is ever growing, and whereas this working of the curse can be broken only by means of the atonement, the observation of Huther is groundless "that this does not describe the sins which the ἁμαρτωλός would still commit and which are now prevented by means of his conversion (Pott: "*multa futura impediet*"), but the whole multitude of sins which he had committed before his conversion." This restriction misapprehends the progressive nature of guilt, not to say anything of the circumstance, that the reference is no longer exclusively to the sins of converted individuals. The conclusion of the Epistle shows in general, as we have seen repeatedly before, that the usual exposition does by no means come up to the lofty stand-point and point of view of James. De Wette takes objection to the strong idea πλῆθος, saying that the reference is only to aberration and not to viciousness of life and seeks to arrange his assertion by inferences; Stolz asserts that the sinner's amendment of life has the effect of consigning to oblivion his former transgressions; even Wiesinger and Huther restrict the import of the passage in two ways: "the reference is only to the multiform sin of the aforesaid converted individual and only to the circumstance that the converter becomes by his conversion the occasion of God forgiving his sins. "But our passage reminds us of the relation of Paul to his people, Rom. ix. 3; xi. 14. And as James, according to Acts, exhibited a

peculiar fidelity in working for the salvation of his people, and, according to tradition, interceded for them with God, so at the conclusion of the Epistle he here invites the whole believing part of his people to engage in intercession and in the work of salvation, that many individuals might be saved from death, and a multitude of sins might be atoned for. The whole Epistle shows that he confines himself solely to human saving and atoning as a medium of bringing back the people to the true Redeemer and Reconciler, but he deems it of peculiar importance that the brethren must not fail to do their part in the work. Of course his words, in their sententious form, are also here so construed, that they possess a general and eternally valid apostolical significance; but as it was the duty of the expositor throughout the course of his exposition to give prominence to the noble historical import of this Epistle, which has been only too much missed and neglected, so he does at its conclusion.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The long-suffering patience required of the followers of Jesus is a duty of so wide a range, that the discharge of it, at least under many circumstances, would be too much for human strength, if the strength of their faith and hope were not animated by the thought of the nearness of the Lord's coming. Therefore the words "the coming of the Lord is nigh" ought to be constantly before our eyes. While the Christians of the Apostolic Age were perhaps too much inclined to consider the coming of Christ to be near at hand in a literal sense, the Christian sense of our own age suffers this great final event to stand too much in the background and substitutes for it in most instances a mere individual hope of salvation immediately after death. The more we learn again that we belong "to men also that love His appearing" (2 Tim. iv. 8) in the Apostolic acceptation of the term, the easier we shall find the practice of Christian patience and endurance in view of this the only satisfactory final development of the drama of history.

2. James as well as our Lord Himself (Matth. xiii. and elsewhere), saw the kingdom of grace reflected and portrayed in the kingdom of nature. The disciple of Jesus may learn much from the diligent and patient waiting of the husbandman.

3. The heroes of faith of the Old Testament are regarded by James also in the light of patterns to the Christian in his course, just as in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ch. xi. xii.). The rule that the way through suffering leads to glory, is in reality as valid under the Old Testament as under the New. Cf. Luke xxiv. 26; Acts xiv. 22.

4. James begins (ch. i. 12) and ends (ch. v. 11) his Epistle with a beatitude, just as our Lord began (Matth. v. 3) and ended (Jno. xx. 29). His instructions with similar beatitudes. The introduction of the example of Job is the more remarkable because this is the only place in the New Testament where his history is referred to.

5. The dehortation from frivolous swearing is intimately and naturally connected with the notice of endurance and patience, which precedes it. Those who are impatient and discontented will readily curse and swear in their violence, while those who possess their souls in patience will also in this respect guard their mouth and keep their lips. The context shows abundantly that James does not absolutely prohibit all swearing, but only those oaths which men take when they are not as patient as Job (Job ii. 10), but as impatient as Job (ch. iii. 1), when they curse their day. Like Christ, (Matth. xxiii. 16–22) the Apostle condemns light and trifling swearing and specifies several examples thereof. Had he intended to forbid swearing by the name of God, he would doubtless have mentioned this first and most weighty oath before all others. But considering that the law expressly enjoined swearing by the name of the Lord (Numb. vi. 13, *b;* x. 20) and that the prophets referred to this swearing as the characteristic of the servants of the Lord (Is. lxv. 16; Jer. xii. 16; xvi. 14, 15), it is *à priori* highly improbable that James, who was penetrated through and through by the spirit of the Old Testament, should have intended to forbid also this oath. Swearing by the name of God is not only permitted but often becomes necessary in an imperfect state of society because of the sins of men, although it belongs surely to the ideal of the kingdom of God that no oath will be required in it and that yea and nay are as reliable as an oath. In this respect we may say, that the Christian, if the civil authority requires him to take an oath, is necessitated to do so only in consequence of his sojourn in the midst of this sinful and wicked world. In a certain sense we may say of oaths what Paul said of the law that τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη Gal. iii. 19. Cf. Lange on Matth. v. 33–37, and on the Hebrew formulæ of oaths in general Rüetschi in Herzog's *R. E.* III. p. 713 sqq.

6. Genuine Christian faith is distinguished by becoming equanimity in good and evil days, as prescribed by James (ch. v. 13) and illustrated *inter alia* by Paul (Phil. iv. 10–20). Without Christ man is very apt to despond under suffering and equally prone to become elated with prosperity. The true Christian will in suffering seek consolation in prayer and so enjoy his prosperity that God is glorified thereby.

7. The visitation and comforting of the sick is one of the most natural and important parts of the *cura pastoralis*. For special directions consult the works on pastoral and practical theology of Hüffell, Harms, Nitzsch, Palmer and al. [Also Burnet, on the Pastoral Care, Wilson's *Parochialia, Visitatio Infirmorum* and Vinet.—M.]. On the true Christian frame of mind on the sick-bed compare an essay by N. Beets, translated from the Dutch in the *Jahrbuch des rheinisch-westphälischen Schriftvereins*, 1862, p. 1 etc. [Also an excellent work, published anonymously, entitled "Sickness, its trials and blessings," New York: 1857.—M.].

8. Only by confining oneself to the sound of the words (vv. 14–16), it is possible to find here the precepts of extreme unction and auricular confession in the sense of the Roman Catholic Church. See under Exegetical and Critical. James refers plainly to miraculous recovery and to the mutual confession of offences among bre-

thren in the event of one having failed in his duty towards another. On the other hand there exists also an Ultra-Protestantism and Anti-Romanism, which deems the use of both these means of grace altogether superfluous and almost prohibits them, which is likewise without blessing. The decrease of the gift of miracles is surely no proof of the increase of faith, and the entire discontinuance of mutual confession of sins is a sad token of the want of humility and brotherly love. Cf. Herzog's *R. E.* Article *Oelung*.

9. It may be very superstitious and uncharitable to assume a direct connection of a certain sin and a certain disease; cf. Jno. ix. 3. But it is also very superficial to deny all connection between sin and disease. If there were no sins in the world, there would certainly be no plagues. The sick man consequently does well, if he recalls on the sick-bed first of all his own sins and seeks to obtain their forgiveness. Forgiveness of sins and recovery from sickness are in many respects more closely connected than most people think and therefore both are promised to the citizen of the celestial commonwealth, Is. xxxiii. 24.

10. The duty of brotherly exhortation addressed to backsliding brethren (vv. 19, 20), so warmly recommended by the Apostle, has also been enjoined by our Lord and the Apostles elsewhere (cf. Matth. xviii. 15–18; 1 Thess. v. 14; 2 Thess. iii. 13–16; Heb. x. 24). The writings of pagan moralists contain also excellent directions concerning the manner how such friendly reproof should be administered. See *e. g.* Plutarch, *de discrim. amici et adulatoris* pp. 244–276, *edit. Reisk.;* Cicero, *de amicitia* cap. 24, 25. A striking proof of the blessing which may attend such a work of love towards the salvation of an almost lost soul, and of the manner how this duty should be discharged, is found in the well-known legend "John and the robber-chief," told by Clem. Alex., *quis dives salvus*, cap. 42. But James shows himself throughout this Epistle as an exemplar of ardent Christian zeal for converting sinners from the error of their way and for saving souls from death. His words open a wide field and a glorious prospect to Christian philanthropy and the specific cure of souls. Hence Zwingli and Herder are not wrong in their criticisms on the conclusion of this Epistle; the former saying: "*Insigni doctrina veluti colophone epistolam absolvit*," and the latter: "The conclusion, the strongest assurance, is like a seal affixed to the testament."—

[On the connection of vv. 12, 13 with v. 11. Bp. Sanderson, (Lectures on Oaths, vii. 11): "Set the examples of ancient prophets and holy men before your eyes. If ye suffer adversity, imitate their patience. If in all things, you cannot attain to that perfection, yet thus far at least, except ye be very negligent, you may go with ease; above all things, take heed lest too impatient of your grief, or too much transported with your joy, ye break forth into rash oaths, to the dishonour of God and shame of Christian conversation. But rather contain yourselves, whether troubled or rejoicing, within the bounds of Modesty; mingle not Heaven and earth, let not all things be filled with your oaths and clamours; if you affirm a thing, let it be with calmness, and a mere affirmation or negation. But if either of these passions be more impetuous, and strive to overflow the narrow channels of your bosoms, it will be your wisdom to let it forth unto the glory of God. Do you demand by what means? I will tell you: *Is any among you afflicted?* Let not his impatience break forth into Oaths and Blasphemies, the Flood-gates of wrath; but rather let him pray, and humbly implore God that He would vouchsafe him Patience, till His heavy hand be removed. *Is any merry?* Let him not bellow it forth in Oaths, like a Bacchanalian, but rather sing it in Hymns and Psalms unto the praise of God: Who hath made his cup to overflow, and crowned him with happy days."

BARROW: (Serm. XV. vol. I. p. 329). "In these words St. James doth not mean universally to interdict the use of oaths: for that in some cases is not only lawful, but very expedient, yea needful, and required from us as a duty; but *that* swearing which our Lord had expressly prohibited to His disciples, and which thence, questionless, the *brethren* to whom St. James did write, did well understand themselves to forbear, having learnt so in the first Catechisms of Christian institution; that is, *needless and heedless swearing in ordinary conversation*, a practice then frequent in the world, both among Jews and Gentiles; the invoking of God's name, appealing to His testimony, and provoking His judgment, upon any slight occasion, in common talk, with vain incogitancy, or profane boldness. From such practice the holy Apostle dehorteth in terms importing his great concernedness, and implying the matter to be of the highest importance: for, *Before all things, my brethren, do not swear;* as if he did apprehend this sin of all other to be one of the most heinous and pernicious. Could he have said more? would he have said so much, if he had not conceived the matter to be of exceeding weight and consequence?"

V. 14. HOOKER: *Eccl. Polit.* v. 25. 3. "The authority of the Priest's *calling* is a furtherance, because if God had so far received him into favour as to impose upon him by the hands of man that office of blessing the people in His name, and making intercession to Him in theirs, which office he hath sanctified with His own most gracious promise, and ratified that promise by manifest actual performance thereof, when others before in like place have done the same; is not his very ordination a seal, as it were, to us, that the self-same Divine Love that hath chosen the Instrument to work with, will by that Instrument effect the thing whereto He ordained it, in blessing His people, and accepting the prayers, which His servant offered up unto God for them?"

V. 16. HOOKER: vi. 47. "But the greatest thing which made men forward and willing upon their knees to confess whatsoever they had committed against God, and in no wise to be withheld from the same with any fear of disgrace, contempt or obloquy, which might ensue, was their fervent desire to be helped and assisted with the prayers of God's saints. Wherein as St. James doth exhort unto *mutual confession*, alleging this only for a reason, that *just men's devout prayers* are of great avail with God; so it hath been heretofore the use of penitents for that intent to unburthen

their minds, even to *private* persons, and to crave their prayers." He quotes the following beautiful passages from Ambrose *de Poenit.* II. 10, and Tertullian, *de Poenit.* c. 10.

AMBROSE: "Let thy mother the Church weep for thee, let her wash and bathe thy faults with her tears: our Lord doth love that many should become supplicants for one." The reference is to *voluntary* penitents, who openly repented and confessed.

TERTULLIAN: "Some few assembled make a Church, and the Church is as Christ Himself; when thou dost therefore put forth thy hands to the knees of thy brethren, thou touchest Christ, it is Christ unto whom thou art a suppliant; so when they pour out their tears over them, it is even Christ that taketh compassion; Christ which prayeth when they pray: neither can they be easily denied, for which the Son Himself is contented to become the suitor." The reference is still to *voluntary* penitents.

On *private* confession, Hooker asserts and afterwards proves his assertion that the practice was unknown in the earliest and purest ages of the Church. "I dare boldly affirm, that for many hundred years after Christ the Fathers held no such opinion; they did not gather by our Saviour's words any such necessity of seeking the priest's absolution from sin, by *secret* and (as they now term it) *sacramental* confession: *public* confession, they thought necessary by way of discipline, not *private* confession, as in the nature of a sacrament, necessary." *Eccl. Pol.* VI. 4, 6. —M.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Vv. 7–12. Christian long-suffering immeasurably different from stoical insensibility.—The Lord's coming a consolation to the godly, a terror to the ungodly.—What the Christian, and especially the minister of the Gospel, may learn from the husbandman.—"Behold, the husbandman" etc. an excellent text for missionary discourses; waiting for the Lord should be 1, desired, 2, patient, 3, active, and 4, hopeful.—Rainy seasons must precede the day of harvest both in the kingdom of nature and in that of grace.—Christians, if opposed, should not groan against one another, but pray so much the more to God the Lord.—The witnesses of the truth at once the patterns of its professors.—The blessedness of the suffering; 1, the worth it possesses; 2, the price at which it is acquired.—The end of God's ways a blessing to His people.—Lawful and unlawful use of oaths.—Christian love of the truth in relation to an unholy world.

STARKE:—A Christian patiently waits for the harvest of the promised riches of eternity, while meanwhile the early rain and the latter rain of the grace of Jesus Christ moistens and refreshes his often weary heart.

HEDINGER:—Hope sows the seed and calmly sleeps on the pillow of Divine Providence until the time of harvest, *i. e.* of a gracious answer, v. 7. Ps. xxviii. 7.

QUESNEL:—O sinner, how many iniquities dost thou commit behind the door, in secret. But behold, the Judge standeth at the door, Is. xxix. 15.

CRAMER:—We are not better than our fathers (1 Kings xix. 4); therefore the prophets and patriarchs, Christ and His Apostles teach us not only by words but by their deeds to be patient, Lam. iii. 26.

LANGII OP.:—Suffering and patience are well conjoined, for the sufferings which we endure for God and for conscience' sake, differ most from other sufferings in patience, 1 Cor. iv. 12.

OSIANDER:—The virtues of the saints are shown us in Holy Scripture, not that we may only marvel at them, but that we may imitate them, Heb. xiii. 7.—God had also besides the Jewish people those who were His, who served Him in spirit and in truth. The Church of God is therefore not tied to a particular people or sect, Job. i. 1.—God will not remember the sins of believers (Is. xliii. 25), but always the good which they have done (Matth. xxv. 35).—Oaths should not be lightly used nor become habitual to us; yet nothing is less thought of in the world than this most important matter.

STIER:—The whole period of the world's duration with its thousands of years of mankind upon earth is a mighty sowing for the final harvest in which the earth, having received its seed from heaven, is to give its fruit to heaven. At the harvest we shall understand the ways of God. If many things are dark and confused to us now, let us wait only for the time of the ripening! This applies to every individual in respect of this life's day of grace, it applies in its highest and best sense to the true Christian who really lives for eternity. There passes throughout all Christendom, there lives in the hearts of all saints a constant presentation [*i. e.* making present—M.] of the end, and this is right; for the coolness with which we now reflect and consider and remove the last day to an indefinite distance, is rather a consequence of lukewarm faith, of love grown cool.—

V. 10. We learn from this word, as we do here from James, that Job did really live like Noah, Daniel and all the prophets, and that the history of his sufferings is not a didactic poem, but genuine history. At that time indeed most people had only *heard* of him, for reading was then the prerogative of the learned, and even these had only in rare instances all the books of Holy Writ. Have *we* indeed read the book of Job aright? "A word, a man"—this [German] proverb alas has almost ceased to be true, and keeping one's word has fearfully decreased among men, because lightness has increased. Would that it could be said everywhere at least "A Christian, a word" [*i. e.* a Christian, who pledges his word, should attach to it the sanctity of an oath.—M.].

JAKOBI:—Swearing is also still common amongst us and in order to guard against its abuse, Christian authorities have taken the oath under their supervision and, as it were, under their protection. But that oaths are so often required by the authorities, that most people, if required, take them lightly and thoughtlessly, that they are eager to take an oath in order to gain perchance some little advantage, that so many oaths and oathlike phrases are heard in common life, that the simple yea and nay without the confirmation of an oath have in many things and with many men almost lost their

power and value, all these are so many sad and suspicious symptoms of wide-spread untruthfulness and unreliability.

Viedebandt:—Patience in view of the blessed future in store for them, strengthening the heart against the temptation to impatience and murmuring, and particularly to a vengeful groaning against the oppressor, this is the task of the followers of Christ and of the saints of God whose life bears testimony to God, who never leaves His own, in patience and hope that is not deceived.

Neander:—Every word should be to the Christian what an oath is to others; there is no need of oaths, therefore, among true Christians, because each holds his word sacred and all reciprocate among themselves the assurance that the word of each is tantamount to an oath. Thus it ought to be in a truly Christian congregation, wherein all mutually know one another as genuine Christians.

Heubner (on vv. 7, 8):—A passage for the *ecclesia pressa, militans.*—

(V. 10). Examples are peculiarly effective to strengthen us in suffering. They show us 1, the possibility of endurance, of victory by means of the strength of God; 2, the glory, the reward of those who have ended their warfare.

Lisco (on vv. 7, 11):—What exhorts us Christians to be patient in tribulation?

V. 12. Swear not lightly!—

Porubszky (on vv. 7–9). The coming of the Lord in the light of our time. (on vv. 10, 11). Our gain from the sufferings of Christ (!!)—(on v. 12). Veracity the result of the fear of God.

Vv. 7, 8. Text for the harvest feast [Thanksgiving Day in U. S.—M.]. Wolf: Every earthly harvest-feast should renew our sense of the value of the hope of heaven.

(vv. 7–11. Epistle for the 24th Sunday after Trinity in the Grand Duchy of Hesse and elsewhere).

Gerok:—Three approved domestic remedies in adversity.

Böckel:—Encouragement to the dignified endurance of undeserved sufferings.—The power of a good example.—

(On vv. 13–20). Joy and grief must be sanctified by religion.—The power of prayer under suffering.—Christian rejoicing in God.—The Christian on the sick-bed.—The sick should send for the presbyter and not always expect him to come uncalled.—On the gift of miracles in the primitive Church.—The cause of its disappearance.—Duty and blessing of mutual confession of sins.—The *confessio auricularis* a caricature of the brotherly confession in the time of James.—The forgiveness of sins a chief requisite for the sick.—Intercession a duty of Christian love. 1. How much belongs to it. 2. How much is wanting in it!—Elias a teacher of prayer. We see in him a righteous man who 1, prays; 2, prays earnestly; 3, whose earnest prayer availeth much.—He that is saved himself should seek to gain others also.—The true Christian 1, is able; 2, is bound to; 3, and will save souls from death. —Saving brotherly love: 1, how much it costs; 2, how richly it recompenses.

Starke: Quesnel:—The use of spiritual songs is greater than is thought. Ps. lxix. 31, 32.

Cramer:—It should be our first business in sickness to turn to God and have prayers offered for us, then send for the physician.

Starke:—Maladies are the fruits of sins. Poor man, if thou hast spent the days of thy health in the service of sins, be not surprised if thy Creator takes hold of the rod of sickness in order to lead thee to better thoughts, Lev. xxvi. 15 etc.—If you have offended or vexed others, be not ashamed to confess it.

Hedinger:—The prayer of the righteous availeth much, yet not everything. For God often sees that the granting of our prayers would be contrary to His will, nor salutary to ourselves, and it is often a great blessing, although not generally recognized, that God refuses to grant our requests. 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9.

Starke:—God is so good that He does not always keep His power to Himself, but often equips also His children with it, Phil. iv. 13.

Quesnel:—God gives us fruitful seasons and they are kept up by prayer, Acts. xiv. 17.

Starke:—As the salvation of the soul is infinitely more precious than that of the body, so much the more is God pleased if we do more for our neighbour in the concerns of his soul than in those of his body, Heb. iii. 13.

Hedinger:—Be not more merciful to thy neighbour's ox and house than to his precious soul. That thou pullest out of a well, this, if on fire, thou puttest it out, but thou dost not counsel his soul in brotherly reproof though it fall into hell and burn in the most dreadful flames of sin. Those who love God promote also their neighbour's salvation and lead the blind on an even path, 1 Thess. v. 14.

Langii op.:—Teachers are bound first and mostly to observe that which is the duty of all Christians, to wit, the real instruction of their hearers, 2 Tim. ii. 24.—Hearers are greatly honoured if God counts them worthy to become also the spiritual fathers of spiritual children, 1 Thess. v. 11. If a woe is uttered on those who ruin others (Matth. xviii. 7), what will be the reward of grace to those who have been the instruments of God in the conversion of others! Dan. xii. 3. —Blessed is the man who is ready to be admonished and to be speedily turned from his error. He who thinks that in this respect others have no right to speak to him, robs himself of the blessing which he might obtain through others.

Stier:—Human song is of itself good and noble. The same God, who gave to the fowls of the air the voice with which they unconsciously praise Him, gave song to man. We remember how *e. g.* Luther rightly extols the science and gift of song. Who has received it, let him rejoice, who lacks it, let him seek, if possible, to waken it, for it is a good gift of the Creator which generally belongs to human nature.—Would that our present presbyteries did consist of men who understood something more than to keep accounts! [Stier is a Presbyterian—M.]—Every Christian should be to his brother Christian a priest who receives the confession and dispenses the absolution.—(vv. 19, 20). The greatest want and the greatest work of faith.—The Lord alone can help, deliver, and save the souls. But He does it and

uses for that purpose instruments of His power, vessels of His grace. Hence the Scripture hesitates not to attribute to *us* miserable sinners the salvation of our fellow sinners. The Apostle labours to save some among His people, Rom. xi. 14. To Timothy, the bishop, he promises: "In doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. iv. 16. In like manner he refers to a wife that may save her husband, and to a husband that may save his wife, 1 Cor. vii. 16. Yes, brethren, we may save one another, help one another from death to life: this is truly a great, the greatest and most precious promise of the rich grace of God to our poor soul.

Jakobi:—Among our Christian brethren of another communion, from whom separated three hundred, years ago for liberty's and conscience' sake, the use of anointing with oil, recommended in our text, has been retained, and a devout sick man among them cannot rest until he has received this *extreme unction* at the priest's hands. Now although we cannot help seeing in this practice a complete misapprehension of these words of Holy Writ and a lamentable superstition, have we not, we ask, gone similarly astray, while there continues among us the sad evil habit of celebrating the Lord's Supper in so unconscious a state and of considering the taking of it immediately before death to be *necessary*, after the Holy Table had often before been unfrequented for years?

Neander:—To excite more than one to repentance of a single sin, and thus to pave his way towards obtaining the forgiveness of one sin, is to draw him away from the whole sinful bias of his life and to restore in him the state of a new, Divine life. Thereby many sins, which plunged him into his former course, are covered.

Viedebandt:—*Pray for one another.* Such a precept is not found in the catechism of worldly friendship. Alas, how much ungodly friendship. It is like thorn-hedges which have grown the one into the other, united as it were in order to pierce and to tear. Noxious bind-weed!—while the soul is tied, prayer is tied also. Patience in suffering flows from hope for joys.

von Gerlach: (v. 13).—Sadness and gladness are alike dangerous to the Christian; the devil takes advantage of every strong emotion to draw him away from God. Prayer and praise act like weapons against him.—

Heubner (v. 13):—The value of spiritual songs as compared with worldly songs (v. 15). Faith is the soul of prayer: without that it is faint and dead.—Prayer is one of the most glorious expression of free-will.—We also, like Elias, may pray for temporal things—(vv. 19, 20). The infinite value of a human soul.—

Lisco: (vv. 13–18).—Of the abuse and the right use of the name of God.—Several Christian rules of life.—Prayer 1, in all the situations of life, 2, especially with the sick, 3, availeth much.—(vv. 19, 20). Loving care for the conversion of sinners.—The blessed occupation of saving souls: 1, the motives that should prompt us; 2, the manner how we should set to work; 3, the blessing that attends it.

Porubszky:—True cheerfulness.—Faith gives health.—Of the fruit of prayer.—The conversion of sinners the most laudable work of faith.—

[V. 10. Jortin:—History sacred and secular shows us men naturally as weak as we are, liable to the same temptations of vanity, conceit, pride, sensual affections, fear, wrath, envy and malice, yet conquering these foes to their salvation. They had as quick a sense of pleasure and pain, of love and aversion, of profit and loss, of plenty and poverty, of honour and dishonour, as we; and yet they overcame the world by their faith, and by the influence of true religion upon their minds. They had indeed the Divine assistance to strengthen their infirmity; and so may we, if we seek it as they did.

V. 11. Bp. Sanderson:—Job held out in his patience under his great trial unto the last: and God out of pity and in His tender mercy towards him, heaped comforts upon him at the last in great abundance. It would be well worthy of our most serious meditation, to consider both what by God's grace he did, and how by God's mercy he sped. His example in the one would be a good pattern to us of patience: and his reward in the other a good encouragement for consolation. This we may rest upon as a most perfect truth, that if we do our part, God will not fail on His.

V. 14. Nedarim p. 40, 1. "Rabba, as often as he fell sick, forbade his domestics to mention it for the first day: if he did not then begin to get well, he told his family to go and publish it in the highways, that they who hated him, might rejoice: and they that loved him, might intercede with God for him."

Rabbi Simeon in *Sepher Ha Chayim* said: "What should a man do, who goes to visit the sick? *Ans.* He who studies to restore the health of the body, should first lay the foundation in the health of the soul." The wise men have said, "No healing is equal to that which comes from the *word of God and prayer.*" Rabbi Phineas, the son of Chamma, has said, "When sickness or disease enters into a man's family, let him apply to *a wise man*, who will implore mercy in his behalf."—M.]

THE

EPISTLES GENERAL OF PETER.

BY

G. F. C. FRONMÜLLER, Ph. D.,

PASTOR AT KEMNATH, WÜRTEMBERG.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND REVISED GERMAN EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS ORIGINAL AND SELECTED,

BY

J. ISIDOR MOMBERT, D. D.,

RECTOR OF ST. JAMES'S CHURCH, LANCASTER, PA.

NEW YORK:

CHARLES SCRIBNER, & CO., 654 BROADWAY.

1867.

Stereotyped by
JAS. B. RODGERS,
PHILADELPHIA.

THE

FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE APOSTLE.

SIMON PETER, son of Jonas (Matt. xvi. 17; John i. 42, xxi. 16), and brother of Andrew (Matt. x. 2; John i. 41), was born at Bethsaida, a village on the coast of the sea of Galilee (John i. 44), where in those days many receptive minds were animated by a desire for the advent of the Messiah. He owned a house at Capernaum (Matt. viii. 14; Luke iv. 38), was married there, and followed the trade of a fisherman (Matt. iv. 18; Mark i. 16; Luke v. 2). Andrew, his brother, a disciple of John the Baptist, who had believed his teacher's word, "Behold the Lamb of God," and thereupon had become a disciple of Jesus, told him the glorious discovery he had made, and took him to Jesus. On his first acquaintance with the Searcher of hearts, he received the surname, Cephas, Peter, the man of rock (John i. 42). This circumstance partly denotes his natural disposition, and partly a prediction of what, on the foundation of that disposition, grace would make of him. His fiery temperament, his quick resoluteness, his fearless courage, and his unreserved candour, were to be purified, glorified and confirmed by his love of Jesus, and by the power of the Holy Ghost. Thus only could he become a rocky foundation of the church of Christ (Matt. xvi. 18). After sundry meetings and preparations, the Lord attached him to the number of his permanent disciples. The miraculous blessing which is recorded in Luke v. 1, etc., and made Peter deeply conscious of his own unworthiness and of our Lord's exaltation and holiness, was the turning point in his career. His call to the Apostolate is narrated in Matt. iv. 18–20, and Luke v. 10, 11. In the four catalogues enumerating the twelve apostles, he is invariably named first, Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13. His full resignation to the Lord, and his deeper insight of his Divine Sonship, made him not only share with John and James their Master's more intimate friendship (Mark v. 37; Matt. xxvi. 37), but also enjoy a special preference over the rest of the apostles (Matt. xvi. 18, 19). Every where he appears as first among the apostles, but only as first among equals, placed not *above*, but *on a level with* them. (cf. Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 21; Luke viii. 45; ix. 32; John i. 42; xxi. 15; Acts i. 15; ii. 14; viii. 14; x. 5; xv. 7.) Among the other disciples he was clothed with the dignity of being their spokesman, (Matt. xvi. 16; xxvi. 33; xvii. 24,) without thereby having a claim to outward superiority, for all believers were to regard each other as brethren and members under their one head, Christ (Matt. xxiii. 8; John xiii. 14). Besides the important and characteristic epochs of his life already mentioned, we have the following: his walking on the sea, which was designed to make him clearly conscious of the value of his own strength, in which he had so much confided (Matt. xiv. 29, etc.); his offence at the Passion of Jesus, when he undertook to censure and reprove his Master, while

the word of the keys of the kingdom was still ringing in his ears (Matt. xvi. 22. 19).—Again, his wish to build tabernacles on the mount of transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 4); his believing obedience to a direction which ran wholly counter to reason, occasioned by a question concerning the temple-tribute (Matt. xvii. 27); his inquiry as to the reward flowing from his following Christ (Matt. xix. 27); his refusal to allow Jesus to wash his feet, hastily followed by the opposite extreme, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head" (John xiii. 8, etc.); his promise to go with the loved Master into prison and death; his asseveration rather to die than deny his Lord [Matt. xxvi. 35], arising from reliance on his own strength and disregard of the words of Jesus, followed by the deep fall of his threefold denial (Matt. xxvi. 31–35. 58. 69, etc.). The wilful defence of his Master with the sword (John xviii. 10. 11); his tearful repentance after meeting the look of Jesus (Matt. xxvi. 75; Mark xiv. 72); his hurrying forth to the tomb of the risen Saviour, who had appeared to him before the other disciples (Luke xxiv. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5); the loving zeal with which he anticipated the others in greeting the Master on the shore of the lake (John xxi. 7), where Jesus foretold him his destiny (John xxi. 18, etc.); his reply to the Redeemer's question, "Lovest thou me?" and his restoration to the pastoral office by the charge, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." (John xxi. 15, etc.)

In the first twelve chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, Peter appears as the chief organ of the Church at Jerusalem. (Acts i. 15; ii. 14). He is the spokesman of the other Apostles on the day of Pentecost, and preaches a mighty sermon on repentance, which pierces the hearts of three thousand hearers like a fiery arrow. He multiplies the number of believers both by the working of miracles, and the victorious power of the Gospel. (Chap. iii. 4; v. 15; ix. 34. 40). He deems it joy to endure the ignominy of Christ; and suffers neither threatenings nor ill treatment to make him falter in confessing the name of Jesus. (Ch. iv. 8; v. 29). He joins John in carrying the Gospel to Samaria (ch. viii. 14), and the coast regions of the Mediterranean. (Ch. x. 23). He is the first Apostle, who, in consequence of a vision with which he was honoured, received Gentiles into communion of the Christian Church. (Ch. x. 34). He defends this measure against the reproaches of the Jewish Christians, and protects the Gentile Christians from the heavy yoke of the Mosaic Law. (Ch. xi. 1, etc.; xv. 7, etc.). If, under the impulse of the moment, he was carried away into a course of action which contradicted those principles (Gal. ii. 12), he suffered himself by the correction of Paul the Apostle, to abandon the transient wavering of the new position he had taken. After the beheading of James the Apostle, Herod Agrippa cast Peter into prison, whence he was miraculously delivered by an angel. (ch. xii. 1.). After a brief absence, (ch. xii. 17), subsequent to the death of his enemy, he reappears at Jerusalem (ch. xv. 7) and declares, with a view to settling the dispute between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, that circumcision and the observance of the ceremonial law ought not to be exacted as necessary to the justification and salvation of believers. This event falls into the year 50 A. D. Since, in the subsequent account of the transactions at Jerusalem, recorded in the book of Acts, Peter ceases to be mentioned, we may conclude that his subsequent sphere of labour had called him away from there. His abode at Antioch, and the incident already mentioned above, belongs to the time from A. D. 52 to 54 (Gal. ii. 11–14.). It is clear, from 1 Cor. ix. 5, that Peter undertook various journeys for the spread of the kingdom of God. According to an ancient tradition in Origen, which originated probably in the title of his first Epistle, Peter is said to have preached the Gospel to the Jews scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia Minor, and Bithynia. He appears for some time to have had his sphere of labour in the Parthian empire, since he sends salutations from his co-elected at Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13), which is probably not to be understood of Rome, but of Babylon, in Chaldea. Many Jews were dispersed there, and Christianity was early diffused in those regions. According to Dionysius of Corinth, who wrote in the second half of the second century, and according to Irenæus and Eusebius, Peter and Paul are said to have been together at Rome, and to have conjointly founded the Church at that place; Eusebius narrates that the two Apostles had shared a common martyrdom there; Peter was crucified with his head downwards. The fourteenth year of the reign of Nero, from the middle of October, A. D. 67, to the middle of A. D. 68, is mentioned as the year of the Apostle's death. Tertullian and Lactantius also report the common execution of the two Apostles, whose tombs were shown at Rome as early as the end of the second century. See Winer s. v. *Petrus*. The most ancient witness for the Apostle's stay

at Rome, is Papias, who refers to John (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39; ii. 15). With these early testimonies to support us, we refuse being misled by the critics (Spanheim, Baur, Schwegler, and others), who dispute Peter's stay at Rome. With reference to the Apostle's sphere of labour, we have still to mention the circumstance that, (as we learn from Gal. ii. 9), Paul and the pillars among the first Apostles gave to each other the right hand of fellowship at the apostolic council of Jerusalem, in token that Paul would recognize as his peculiar vocation, and carry out the mission among the Gentiles, while they would act in like manner with regard to the mission among the Jews. Peter is particularly named, as having had confided to him the Gospel of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 7. 8), for which he would seem to have been peculiarly fitted, on account of the national peculiarities which were so strongly stamped upon his character. Of him, as the Apostle of the circumcision, it may consequently be presupposed that he would move much on the foundation of the Old Testament, that he would set his testimony of Christ and the salvation that is in Him in the light of the Old Testament, and that he would lay stress on the oneness of both Testaments; while, as the immediate disciple of our Lord, as the witness of His entire ministerial activity and history, and as His favourite Apostle, he would often refer to the words of that beloved Master to whom he was so ardently and devotedly attached. We shall see whether the event confirms these pre-suppositions.

§ 2. SCOPE OF THE EPISTLE.

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren," Luke xxii. 32. Acting on this, his Master's charge, Peter wrote to the strangers of the dispersion. He indicates the design of his writing himself, in chap. v. 12: "I have written briefly, exhorting and testifying that this is the true grace of God, wherein ye stand." They were already converted, believing Christians, who needed not so much a testimony that laid the foundation, as one that was edifying and confirmative (ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν), who required comfort in their tribulation and encouragements to a holy life. The sifting period of believers had partly come already, and was partly approaching; the roaring of the lion that threatened to devour the faithful, was already heard. On this account, the Apostle abounds in exhortations to vigilance and soberness, to right preparation and readiness, to fidelity in confession and life, and endeavours to cast the bright beams of hope of the approaching day of glory into the night of suffering they were about to encounter. He would have them triumph over the sufferings of this present time, with a stedfast look on Christ and their heavenly inheritance. The testimony of Christ is richly interwoven with such repeated encouragements. The sequel will show that Dogmatics and Ethics do not occur separately in this Epistle, but are often directly conjoined, and frequently present a quick, even a bold transition from the one to the other. (cf. ch. ii. 21, etc.; iii. 18, etc.; iv. 1, etc.).

§ 3. CONTENTS AND ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE.

The Title and Salutation of consolation (ch. i. 1, 2), is followed by the exordium, as basis of the argument (ver. 3–12), gratitude for God's saving grace to Christians. The hope of the heavenly inheritance, prepared for them by Christ, should raise them above all temporal suffering. They might measure the greatness of their salvation by the fact that it had been the object of the anxious longing, and diligent search of the prophets, and that even the blessed angels of heaven were looking with profound admiration on this mystery. The entire subsequent contents of the Epistle rest and move on the basis of their possession of salvation and hope. With reference to the state of regeneration, which is presupposed in believers, exhortation and consolation [παραίνεσις and παράκλησις.—M.], appear as leading tendencies from ch. i. 13, onwards. The *first* part of the Epistle comprises ch. i. 13 to ii. 10. The *general* exhortation to become ever more firmly grounded in hope, and on that account, also, in a holy conversation, ch. i. 14–16, to walk in the fear of God, ver. 17–21, to persevere in brotherly love, ver. 22–25, which is again founded on regeneration, ver. 23. The same idea governs the exhortation to grow in the new life, wherein they stand, and to remove whatever hinders or destroys that growth, and more particularly the love of the brethren, ch. ii. 1–3. Whereas that growth is designed to be not only individual, but contemplates the found-

ing of a holy people of God, it is followed by a description of the glory of the Divine edifice, into which they were to suffer themselves to be builded more and more. (Ch. ii. 4–10). At ch. ii. 11, the apostle passes to the *second* part, which continues to ch. iv. 6. It contains *particular* exhortations to Christians, adapted to the circumstances in which they were then placed. As strangers, they should be so much the more dutiful to authority. (Ch. ii. 13–17). Servants were, with constant regard to the example of Christ, to exhibit self-denying obedience to their masters. (Ver. 18–25). Wives should be subject to their husbands in simplicity, quietness, and meekness (ch. iii. 1–6); while husbands were to treat their wives with consideration and affection. (Ch. iii. 7). Then follows an exhortation addressed to all to the practice of mutual affection and brotherly kindness, and of patience and gentleness toward unbelievers. (Ch. iii. 8 to iv. 6). The exhortation is enforced by the consideration of the example of Christ, His sufferings and death, His descent into the nether world, His resurrection and ascension. (Ch. iii. 17–22). From Christ's suffering for us is derived the double duty of patient endurance and of being dead unto sin. They were not to endeavour to avoid suffering, by joining in the vicious practices of the Gentiles, else they would, with them, be exposed to the judgment of God. (Ch. iv. 1–6). The *third* part (ch. iv. 7—v. 11), treats first of the inward union of Christians in the world, without regard to their relations to unbelievers. In view of the end of all things, the Apostle exhorts Christians to prayer, to brotherly love and its exhibitions, to an obliging disposition, and to conscientiousness in the administration of offices of trust. In the second section of this part of the Epistle, we have a new exhortation to readiness of enduring afflictions, which treats the matter from a point of view different from ch. ii. 21, etc.; iii. 14, etc., and affords proof that this was the main object contemplated in this Epistle. They were to regard suffering as necessary to the imitation of Christ, as a refining process, and as a judgment by which the Church of Christ must be sifted according to indispensable laws of the kingdom of heaven. (Ch. iv. 12–19). In the third section, the Apostle addresses the elders in particular, exhorting them rightly to feed the flock of Christ, and to be ensamples to the flock (ch. v. 1–4); then the younger to submit themselves to the elder (ver. 5), and lastly, he entreats all to cleave to humility, meekly to bow under the hand of God, to remain in the faith, to be vigilant, and firmly to resist the devil (ver. 5–9). The conclusion contains a promise full of strong consolation, a remark on the design of his writing, with salutations and the benediction.

§ 4. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPISTLE.

Luther justly designates the Epistle of St. Peter as one of the most noble of the New Testament. It exhibits a wealth of thought, a dignity, a fervour, a humility and love, a believing hope, a readiness for the advent of Christ, in exact harmony with the individuality of the Apostle. His conception of Christianity as the fulfilment of the prophecies of the Old Testament (ch. i. 10–12), in perfect agreement with his speeches in the book of Acts (ch. iii. 18–25), his treatment of Christians as those in whom is realized the idea of the theocratic nation (1 Pet. ii. 9; v. 4. 5), and his uniform plan of tracing back his doctrine of the Person and work of Christ to the Old Testament, show him as the Apostle of the circumcision, whose sphere of labour lay among the Jews, who viewed the Gospel chiefly from the side of its oneness with the Old Covenant. His numerous references to the sayings of our Lord, which will be authenticated below, prove him to have been the ear-witness of the words of Jesus, to whom his soul was attached with the fullest devotion and resignation. The description of Paul, as the Apostle of faith, of John as the Apostle of love, and of Peter as the Apostle of hope, may easily be misunderstood, but it is well-founded, if regarded as indicative of the predominant aim of their respective writings. Weiss has well shown that with Peter hope occupies a central position, that it governs the range of his thoughts, and gives it a peculiar, distinctive impress. Compare particularly ch. i. 3. 7. 9. 13; iii. 9–15; iv. 13; v. 4. It is seen throughout the Epistle that his eye is firmly fixed upon the coming of Christ and the glory in store for believers. This agrees perfectly with the quick and fiery character of Peter, and has been interestingly developed by Weiss. "His natural tendency to look forward to the end of perfection, and to anticipate it at least ideally, was, in the Apostle, glorified and refined into Christian hope by the influence of the Holy Ghost." With respect to manner of statement, it is, its great simplicity notwithstanding, very pregnant,

forcible and lively; sentences and thoughts are manifoldly intertwined and connected by participial constructions, while sudden and abrupt transitions, which are of frequent occurrence, reflect the Apostle's mind. His mode of doctrinal statements concerning Christ and sin, is not as fully developed as in Paul, and lacks the fundamental views which are peculiar to the latter (*e.g.* concerning the believer's communion of life with Christ, concerning the sinner's justification by faith in the merits of Jesus), but their germs and beginnings are unmistakable in the Epistle. (Cf. Schmid, *Bibl. Theology* and Weiss). The latter, after a careful examination of the degree of affinity between the Epistles of Peter and Paul, arrives at the conclusion that Peter's language and mode of instruction are wholly independent of Paul, and rich in exclusive peculiarities, that they contain not less than sixty *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα.* Of the parallel passages in the Epistle to the Romans, and the First Epistle of Peter, he says that they can by no means be considered accidental; that while it must be assumed that the one had read and freely used the other's Epistle, it seems more probable that Paul had read the First Epistle of Peter, when he wrote the Romans, than the reverse. The most important passages to be considered in this respect are:—Rom. xii. 3–8, 1 Pet. iv. 10; Rom. xii. 9–13, 1 Pet. i. 22; Rom. xii. 10, 1 Pet. ii. 17; Rom. xii. 14, etc., 1 Pet. iii. 8. 9–12; Rom. xiii. 1–6, 1 Pet. ii. 13. 14. 17; Rom. xiii. 11. 12, 1 Pet. iv. 7, ii. 9; that the originality belongs to Peter. The same remarks apply to the correspondencies between Ephesians and 1 Peter. Compare 1 Pet. i. 3, Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. ii. 18–20, Eph. vi. 5–9; 1 Pet. iii. 1–7, Eph. v. 22–33; 1 Pet. i. 1, Eph. i. 4; 1 Pet. v. 3, Eph. i. 11; 1 Pet. i. 1, Eph. i. 18; 1 Pet. iii. 5, Eph. i. 12; 1 Pet. i. 5, Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. iii. 22, Eph. i. 20. 21; 1 Pet. i. 14. 15, Eph. ii. 3; 1 Pet. i. 18, Eph. ii. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 18, Eph. ii. 18; 1 Pet. ii. 5. 6, Eph. ii. 20–22; 1 Pet. ii. 2, Eph. ii. 21; 1 Pet. i. 12, Eph. iii. 5. 10; 1 Pet. i. 15, Eph. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10, Eph. iv. 7. 11. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6, Eph. iv. 8–10; 1 Pet. i. 14–19, Eph. iv. 17–24; 1 Pet. ii. 12, iii. 16, iv. 14, Eph. iv. 25–32; 1 Pet. iv. 3, Eph. v. 5; 1 Pet. v. 5, Eph. v. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 18, Eph. vi. 5–9; 1 Pet. v. 8. 9, Eph. vi. 10–20. "In all those passages," says Weiss, "which render a critical opinion possible, all goes in favour of the dependence of the Epistle to the Ephesians." A writer in the German Magazine for Christian Science and Christian Life, objects to the foregoing conclusion, particularly in regard of the Epistle to the Romans, and remarks on Rom. xii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 5, that the Pauline figure is more lucid and simple, and on that account more original; that the same is true of Rom. xii. 3–8; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 10. Also Rom. xii. 14–19; cf. 1. Pet. iii. 8–12; and Rom. xiii. 1–6; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 13, favour the originality of Paul. Rom. ix. 33 also seems to be original, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 6. The problem must be regarded as unsolved. There are only a few passages in the Epistle of James resembling those in St. Peter, *e. g.* Jas. i. 2; 1 Pet. i. 6; Jas. i. 10; iv. 6. 7. 10; 1 Pet. i. 24; v. 5. Some of them contain quotations from the Old Testament; there is only one passage (Jas. iv. 7. 10) which renders a relationship to 1 Pet. v. 8, etc., probable. Peter may have read and made free use of the Epistle of James.

§ 5. READERS OF THE EPISTLE.

The believers, to whom the Epistle is addressed (ch. i. 1), were scattered over almost the entire peninsula of Asia Minor. The ancient fathers, with the exception of Augustine and Cassiodorus, thought that the ἐκλεκτοῖς related to Jewish Christians. This opinion was prevalent until modern times: several commentators added only the modification that those Churches contained also Gentile Christians, who were, however, in the minority. On the other hand, Steiger, followed by Wiesinger, tried to prove, in his commentary, that the majority in those churches were, at all events, Gentiles. Weiss produces, however, convincing arguments that the Epistle was intended for Jewish Christians; he justly affirms:

a. That διασπορά (ch. i. 1) is a *terminus technicus*, and denotes the totality of Jews outside of Palestine, scattered through heathen countries (Jas. i. 1; 2 Macc. i. 27; Judith v. 19), and cannot be taken metaphorically.

b. That the Epistle is entirely permeated by views taken from the Old Testament; it contains numerous Old Testament figures and *termini technici*, allusions to the religious institutions and the history of the Old Covenant. Compare ch. i. 10–12; iii. 5. 6; iii. 20. Peter frequently intertwines quotations from the Old Testament into his language, without designating them as such,

and mostly in connections where it is of essential importance that they should be recognized as Scripture (ch. i. 24; ii. 7. 9. 10, and other passages). No portion of the New Testament is so thoroughly interwoven with quotations from and allusions to the Old Testament. (It contains, in 105 verses, twenty-three quotations, while the Epistle to the Ephesians has only seven, and that to the Galatians, only thirteen).

c. That this peculiarity agrees entirely with the fact that it was Peter's vocation to be the Apostle of the circumcision. The mode of speech which he took from the Old Testament, must have particularly recommended him to Jewish Christians. The passages quoted in favour of Gentile Christians, prove just the opposite, *e. g.* ch. iii. 6; i. 14. 18; ii. 9. 10. See the Commentary on these passages. The same holds good of ch. iv. 3. It would be curious, indeed, that Peter should reproach former Gentiles with having done the will of the Gentiles. The expression ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρείαις only seems to relate to Gentiles; but this presents no obstacle on the supposition that those Churches contained individual Gentile Christians. The Jewish Christians formed, doubtless, the substance and main stem of those Churches (cf. Acts ii. 9; xi. 19), until after the third missionary journey of the Apostle, the element of Gentile Christians became more important in those parts of Asia Minor. (Weiss, p. 115, 116).

§ 6. GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

1 Pet. iv. 17 ought to convince the most undecided that the Epistle was written, at all events, before the destruction of Jerusalem. This is equally evident from the entire presupposed historical situation of the Epistle. Peter describes himself as the author at ch. i. 1; and as witness of the sufferings of Christ, ch. v. 1; this is confirmed by the affinity which exists between the Epistle and Peter's speeches in the book of Acts (cf. Acts ii. 32; iii. 18; 1 Pet. i. 10, etc.; Acts iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 4), and by the testimony of 2 Pet. iii. 1, even if the second Epistle were not genuine. The author's apostolic consciousness is involuntarily expressed in passages like ch. i. 8, in the historical testimony of Jesus, and its application as an exemplar (ch. ii. 21, etc.; iii. 18, etc.). We have seen above that the contents and mode of statement agree with the Apostle's portrait. Guerike calls particular attention to the harmony between the tone of the Epistle and the sensuousness which is characteristic in Peter: "Peter knew, indeed, from his own experience, better than any other, the weakness of the heart of man; for this reason his exhortations are both humane and evangelical, both forcible and gentle; for the same reason he recommends, with so much earnestness, the practice of constancy of faith, in humility and patience, with constant reference to the pattern and glory of Christ; this accounts also for his earnest exhortation to diligent vigilance, in precise proportion to the exalted condition of believers, and especially for his touching and repeated recommendation of humility." The same author notices the only slight intimation of Peter's acknowledging Paul as a true Apostle (ch. v. 12), the suppression of all personality and marked designedness with respect to his agreement with the Apostle of the Gentiles, and, lastly, the clearness, precision, and emphasis of Peter's language. The most weighty *external* reasons support the genuineness of this Epistle. Eusebius testifies that the Epistle was used by Papias and Polycarp. Several passages in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians confirm the testimony of Eusebius. Theodotus, the Valentinian, after the middle of the second century, cites passages from the Epistle (Clem. Alex. ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου ἐπιτομαί). Express testimony in favour of its genuineness, is found in Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. The Epistle stood already in the Old Syriac Peshito, and Eusebius mentions it among the Homologoumena. The new school of Tübingen, which rejects this Epistle on internal grounds, because it does not correspond with its premises, is, therefore, guilty of the most arbitrary hypercriticism. "Among all the writers of Christian Antiquity, there is not one who doubted the genuineness of the Epistle, or had even heard of any doubts concerning it." (Olshausen).

§ 7. DATE OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.

Many circumstances in the Epistle refer its composition to an early date—*e. g.*, the newness of the afflictions which the Churches had to endure, consisting less in persecution than in reproaches (ch. iii. 16; iv. 12. 14); the astonishment of the Gentiles at the Christians abandoning their sinful practices (ch. iv. 4); the expectation that the Gentiles, on becoming better acquainted with the good conversation of Christians, would relinquish their enmity, which was founded on ignorance (ch. ii. 15; ii. 12; iii. 16). To this must be added the as yet undeveloped state of the constitution of the Church, in which the office of presbyter did apparently coincide with the free office of the elders of the Jewish congregation, which may be gleaned from the circumstances that the πρεσβύτεροι of ch. v. 1, are contrasted with the νεώτεροι of ver. 5, while there is made no mention of any other ecclesiastical office; and again the predominance of the Jewish Christians in these Churches (see above), and especially the absence of an antithesis between legalism and true Christianity, beyond the slight allusion at ch. v. 2, must not be overlooked. Weiss, moreover, adduces, in this respect, the whole Petrine form of doctrine, which he regards as preliminary to the Pauline, as well as the peculiar freshness and energy of hope of the impending parousia of Christ. With regard to the latter, we must, in addition to the other reasons for the early composition of this Epistle, lay special emphasis on the circumstance, that it contains no allusion to a twofold parousia, such as we find in the synoptical Gospels and the Revelation of St. John (v. pp. 97 and 53). On the supposition that Paul made use of the Epistle of Peter, and not the reverse (that Peter had seen the Epistle of Paul), and considering that Sylvanus was in 53 A. D., still with Paul (Acts xviii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 19; 1 Thes. i. 1; 2 Thes. i. 1), Weiss argues that the Epistle could hardly have been written before A. D. 54. Since Paul made his third missionary journey between 54 and 57 A. D., when he passed through Galatia and Phrygia, and remained two years at Ephesus, where he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, the date of the composition of this Epistle would fall into 54 or 55 A. D. Assuming, on the other hand, with the majority of commentators, that Peter had seen and made use of the Epistles of Paul, its date would belong to a much later period. Since, according to Hug and de Wette, 63–65 A. D. is the date of the Epistle to the Ephesians; the period 65–67, the year of Peter's death, would be the date of the present Epistle. Thiersch gives the date 63 or 64 A. D., soon after the Epistle to the Hebrews had been forwarded. If it be objected to the date assigned by Weiss, as has been done by Wiesinger: Where did the Jewish Christian Churches, in Pontus, etc., come from as early as 54 or 55 A. D.? the answer should refer not only to Acts ii. 9, but also to ch. xi. 19, where mention is made of the wide dispersion of those who fled "in the persecution that arose about Stephen." Paul had, as early as 45 and 51 A. D., visited those districts during his first and second missionary journeys. The First Epistle of Peter has no record of Churches already organized, but makes mention of elect strangers of the dispersion.

§ 8 LITERATURE.

Especially noteworthy are: Luther, *Exposition of the First Epistle of St. Peter*, 1523.—Calvini *Commentarii in omnes N. T. epistolas.*—Gerhardi *Comm. super priorem et posteriorem D. Petri epistolam, Jena*, 1641.—Calovii *Biblia illustrata.*—W. Steiger, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 1832.—Huther, in Meyer's *Critico-exegetical Comment. of the N. T.*, 1852 [2d ed. 1859.]—Brückner's *Revision of De Wette's Commentary*, 1853.—Wiesinger, *in the continuation of Olshausen's Commentary*, 1856 [3d ed. 1865].—Weiss, *der Petrinische Lehrbegriff*, 1856.

Among the older *practical* works on this Epistle, we mention, besides, Bengel's *Gnomon*, Roos, *Brief Explanation of the two Epistles of Peter*, 1798; H. Rieger's *Contemplations on the New Testament.*

Among the more modern, W. F. Besser's *Epistles of St. Peter Explained to Bible Classes*, 1854, deserves special attention.

[Among *British* authors, Archbishop Leighton *on the First Epistle of Peter*, 2 vols. 8vo., in

various editions, and Dr. John Brown's *Expository Lectures on the First Epistle of Peter*, New York, Carters', will be found most valuable, to which may be added the following:—

1. The General Commentaries on the WHOLE SCRIPTURES, by Poole, Henry, Goadby, S. Clark, Scott, A. Clark, Mant, and D'Oyley; and on the NEW TESTAMENT by Hammond, Whitby, Guyse, Wells, Doddridge, Gilpin, Bloomfield, Alford, and Wordsworth.
2. Commentaries and other works on the *Apostolical Epistles*, the *Catholic Epistles*, and the *Epistle of St. Peter*.
   - *a.* An Exposition of all St. Paul's Epistles, together with an Explanation of those other Epistles of the Apostles St. James, Peter, John, and Jude, by DAVID DICKSON, Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. Folio. London, 1659.
   - *b.* A Paraphrase and Notes on the Seven (commonly called) Catholic Epistles, attempted in imitation of Mr. Locke's manner; to which are annexed several Critical Dissertations, by GEORGE BENSON, D. D. 4to. London, 1756.
   - *c.* A New Literal Translation from the Original Greek, of all the Apostolical Epistles; with a Commentary and Notes, philological, critical, explanatory, and practical, by JAMES MACKNIGHT, D. D. 4 vols. 4to. Edinb., 1795.
   - *d.* Sermons on the First Epistle General of Saint Peter, by NICHOLAS BYFIELD. Folio. London, 1637.
   - *e.* A Brief Exposition of the First and Second Epistles General of St. Peter, by ALEXANDER NISBET, Minister at Irwin. 12mo. London, 1658.

In German.

JOACHIM LANGE, *Mosaisches Licht und Recht.* Halle, 1734.

In French.

Paraphrase sur les Epistres Catholiques, par MOYSE AMYRAUT. 8vo. Saumur, 1646.

In Latin.

- *a.* Particularly the Annotata in the *Critici Sacri.*
- *b.* *In priorem B. Petri Apost. Canonicam Epistolam, eruditissimus Commentarius. Auctore* D. JOANNE HESSELIO *Regis Lovanii Professore.* 8vo. Lovanii. 1658.
- *c.* *Epistolarum Cath. Septem. Græce, cum nova versione Latina ac scholiis grammaticis et criticis, opera* Jo. B. CARPZOVII. 8vo. Folio. Halæ, 1790.
- *d.* D. SAM. FRED. NATH. MORI *Prælectiones in Jacobi et Petri Epist.* 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1794.
- *e.* *Versio Latina Epistolarum, etc., perpetua annotatione illustrata a* GODF. SIGISM. JASPIS. ii. tom. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1797.
- *f.* *S. Apost. Petri Ep. Cath. prior, perpetuo Comm. explicata, etc., per* JACOBUM LAURENTIUM. 4to. Campis, 1640.
- *g.* D. JO. SAL. SEMLERI *Paraphrasis in Ep. 2 Petri et Judæ, etc.* 12mo. Halæ, 1784. Idem: *Paraphrasis in Ep. 1 Petri.* Halæ, 1783.

Besides many others of minor account.—M.]

COMMENTARY.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

Chapter I. 1, 2.

Analysis:—Title and salutation of comfort.

1 Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers[1] scattered throughout Pontus,
2 Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. Elect according to the foreknowledge of
God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit,[2] unto obedience and sprinkling
of[3] the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied.

Verse 1. [1 The German Version, in stricter conformity to the Greek, "To the elect strangers in the dispersion in."—M.]
[Cod. Sin., omits 'Ασίας.—M.]
Verse 2. [2 German, "*in* sanctification *through* the Spirit." *Greek*, "in sanctification *of* the Spirit."—M.]
[3 German "with."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Verse 1.—On the meaning of **Peter**, see notes on Matt. xvi. 18.

Apostle, a messenger of Jesus Christ, speaking and acting in his Master's name. The qualifications necessary to the apostolic vocation may be learned from the speech of Peter at the election of an apostle. Acts i. 21, 22. They had to be the constant attendants of Christ during the whole of His ministerial career, as He said to the twelve: "Ye have been with me from the beginning," Jno. xv. 27; cf. Lke. xxiv. 18, in particular, witnesses of His resurrection and ascension, Acts ii. 33; iii. 15; v. 32; x. 41. They had to testify of the great facts of salvation and to found Churches, to teach and to preach, to exhort and warn, to threaten and rebuke, to intercede and to oversee, and to carry the message of the cross to Jews and Gentiles, Acts x. 39; iv. 19; 2 Cor. v. 20; Phil. i. 7. 17; Col. ii. 8. To this end they had been especially called and chosen, separated and sent forth by the Lord Himself and endowed with extraordinary gifts by the Spirit, Acts xiii. 10. 11; v. 5. 11; ii. 4; Mk. xvi. 17. 18; 1 Cor. v. 5; Jno. xx. 22.

Elect, in Peter's sense of the word, are such as are incorporated in the chosen generation (ch. ii. 9) and belong to the purified people of God, to the children of Abraham who have become believers in Jesus. The final cause of this election is free grace, its end salvation, and its condition penitent faith. Acts iii. 19; ii. 38. 21; 1 Pet. i. 4; v. 10. The word is used in a different sense in Matt. xxii. 14; Eph. i. 4; Acts ix. 15.

Strangers, παρεπιδήμοι denotes persons, residing with others for a short time in a strange place, not citizens, but denizens, cf. Gen. xlvii. 9; Lev. xxv. 23; Heb. xi. 13. Weiss would take it figuratively of the pilgrim-state of Christians on account of the next word, cf. i. 17; ii. 11; but the explanation "to the elect denizens of the dispersion" is more simple. Such a compression of literal and figurative definitions so nearly related in sound, would hardly be intelligible without some further definition. Judith v. 20; 2 Macc. i. 27.

Dispersion (διασπορά) was the current phrase used to designate Jews living in Gentile lands, i. e. residing out of Palestine, cf. Jno. vii. 35; Jas. i. 1. This shows plainly who were the readers of the epistle: they were believing Jews, here and there joined by a few Gentile converts. This was the field confided to the care of Peter, Gal. ii. 7, while the sphere of Paul's labours lay among the Gentiles. Origen, Jerome and Epiphanius, testify that Peter was mainly engaged in preaching the Gospel to the Jews in the countries here specified. Such is the opinion of many among the more ancient commentators. *e. g.* Eu-

sebius, Didymus, Œcumenius, who are followed by Grotius, Calvin and others: (vide Introduction).

Pontus, the extreme north-eastern province of Asia Minor, so called from the Black Sea, on which it borders towards the North; it was there that Aquila, a companion of Paul probably founded a Christian Church. Acts xviii. 2.

Galatia, westward of Pontus, derives its name from the Gauls, a Celtic tribe, which had left its seat on the left bank of the Rhine for Thrace and Greece and had afterwards gone as far as Asia Minor. Paul planted Christianity there. Acts xvi. 6.

Cappadocia lies South of Pontus; Jews of Cappadocia were present at the first Christian Pentecost and heard the declaration of the great works of God.

Asia describes the province, which under the Romans comprised the maritime districts of Mysia, Lydia and Caria with the interior Phrygia.

Bythinia is the extreme north-western district of Asia Minor.

VER. 2—**According to the foreknowledge of God**, should be connected with **elect**: it denotes not mere prescience and precognition, the object of which is indeed not mentioned, but both real distinction and foredecreeing. So ch. i. 20; Acts ii. 28. God knew such as are His from before the foundation of the world and ordained them unto salvation. cf. Jno. x. 14; Acts iv. 28; Rom. viii. 29; ["πρόγνωσις *hic non praescientiam, sed antecedens decretum significat ut et* Act. ii. 28: *idem sensus qui*, Eph. i. 4."—*Grotius*.—M.]

In sanctification of the Spirit.—This relates, as well as the other parts of this verse, to election. The order, by which alone the Divine decree can effect its end in us, is this, that we are sanctified by the Spirit of God. So Paul in 2 Thess. ii. 13: "God hath chosen you to salvation through [ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος.—M.] sanctification of the Spirit." This expression comprises all the gracious influences of the Holy Ghost, from His first gentle knockings to the sealing of grace. The reference of the work of our salvation to the Holy Trinity, which is unmistakably implied in this verse, excludes the application of πνεῦμα to the spirit of man.

[*In Sanctification—Jesus Christ.*—"*Il vous a séparés effectivement d'avec eux, non pas en vous sanctifiant comme il fit le peuple d' Israël au désert, d'une sanctification externe et corporelle seulement, lorsqu 'il le fit arroser du sang de la victime, qui ratefia par sa mort l'alliance de la loy; mais en vous consacrant d'une sanctification intérieure et spirituelle lorsque par la vertu de sa vocation il vous a amenés a l'obéisance de son Evangile et a recevoir l'aspersion du sang de Jesus Christ épandu pour l'établissement de l'alliance de grace en rémission des pêchés.*"—*Amyraut.*—M.]

Obedience, in the sense of Peter, includes the two ideas, to believe revealed truth and to perform the duties which it imposes on us. Obedience of the Divine commandments presupposes faith in their obligatoriness and the justice of God; faith claims obedience as its fruit, just as itself (*i. e.* faith), according to its inmost nature, is an act of obedience. Peter, according to his Old Testament stand-point, views both conjointly. cf. ch. ii. 7. 8; i. 14. 22; iii. 1; iv. 17; Acts iii. 22. 23; v. 32; with Paul the fundamental claims of faith and obedience become separate, Rom. x. 5–9, without any misconception of the ethical element of faith, ch. x. 16. 21; xi. 30; i. 5; ii. 8 2 Thess. i. 8; 2 Cor. x. 5.

Unto sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ,—*ῥαντισμός* corresponding to the Hebrew verbs זָרַק and נָזָה occurs only twice in the N T., here and Heb. xii. 24. The altar of burnt offering, the altar of incense, the vail of the Most Holy place and the ark of the covenant (Lev. i. 5; v. 9; iv. 6. 7. 17. 18; xvi. 14–19) were sprinkled with blood in token that the holy vessels, which became, as it were, also infected with the poison of sin—(by the uncleanness of those who surrounded them)—stood in need of purification. At the sacrifice of the covenant a two-fold sprinkling took place, viz.: that of the altar with one-half of the blood and that of the people with the other. Ex. xxiv. 6–8, cf. Heb. ix. 18–20. This implied not only that both needed purifying, but also that the altar and the people belonged together, and that the remission of sins might fall to the latter. But the sprinkling of the people did not take place until they had declared themselves ready to comply with all the demands of the Divine Law without any exception whatsoever. Ex. xxiv. 3. 7; nor must the circumstance be overlooked that the sanctification of the unclean people unto communion with the Holy God must have gone before, Ex. xix. 10. As in the Old Testament the sprinkling of blood followed upon the sanctified people engaging themselves to implicit obedience, so this passage maintains that the members of the covenant-people of the New Testament are elect unto obedience and unto sprinkling of the blood of Jesus. It is only by the obedience of faith and our firm purpose to subject ourselves to the claims of the Divine Law, that we are made partakers of the atoning virtue of the blood of Jesus. If we stand in God's covenant of grace with the honest endeavour of doing His will, God is pleased to make us ever anew partakers of the virtue of the blood of Jesus, and to cover therewith all the failings and infirmities which still cleave to our obedience as well as to forgive us the sins which are still mingled with it, provided we repent of them and seek for peace. We do not attempt to determine whether the words of our Lord at the institution of the Holy Supper had an essentially determining influence on the view of Peter, (as Weiss, p. 273, assumes as certain) but its reference to the conclusion of the covenant in the Old Testament is undeniable. [The three persons of the Holy Trinity cöoperate, according to the Apostle, in the work of our salvation.—M.]

Grace is here not a Divine attribute, but a gift, as is apparent from its connection with peace, cf. ch. iv. 10; v. 10; iii. 7; i. 10. 13. It is the gift of justification and sanctification, from which flows peace in, and with God and forthwith also peace among men, cf. Rom. i. 7; 2 Jno. 3; Jude 2. In the last passage as at 2 Pet. i. 2, occurs also πληθυνθείη. The epistle of Nebuchadnezzar written after his deliverance, Dan. iii. 31, has in the Greek translation of the LXX. an almost identical introduction. The multiplying relates both to its virtue and to the feeling and taste thereof, cf. Rom. v. 5.

[Wordsworth remarks: "This salutation of the Apostle from Babylon recalls to the mind the greeting sent forth from the same city to all its provinces, by the two Kings of two successive dynasties,—the Assyrian and the Medo-Persian—under the influence of the prophet Daniel, and other faithful men of the first dispersion. They proclaimed in their royal Epistles the *supremacy* of the One True God, the God of Israel. 'Nebuchadnezzar, the King, to all the people, *to you peace be multiplied.*' (εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη, Dan. iv. 1). Darius the King wrote to all people, "*To you peace be multiplied,*" (Dan. vi. 25).

Daniel and the three children turned the hearts of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, and moved them to declare the glory of the true God in letters written 'to all people.' The apostle St. Peter now carries on the work of the ancient prophets, and writes an epistle from Babylon, by which he builds up the Christian Sion in all ages of the world (cf. 2 Peter i. 1. 2. and 1 Peter i. 18), and proclaims to all, 'Peace be multiplied unto you.' —M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Peter refers to his apostleship, not with a view to making it a ground of superiority to other teachers, but in order to remind his readers of the great responsibility attaching to, and consequent upon, the disregard of his exhortations and consolations. Because he is the ambassador of Christ, we should hear him as we would Christ Himself, cf. Lk. x. 16; 1 Thess. iv. 8. He calls himself an elder among elders, ch. v. 1.—Wherever no positive proof can be given of an immediate election and calling to and qualification for the apostolate as emanating from our Lord Himself, its claim is unwarranted and untenable.—This is also true where secular authority is allied to the spiritual office (cf. Matt. xx. 25–28) and where it is attempted to control the faith and conscience of men (cf. 2 Cor. i. 24; 1 Cor. iv. 1).—[The claims of *Rome* are illustrative of the second and third points, those of the *Irvingites* of the first.—M.]

2. The Apostles were not vicegerents and representatives of Christ, much less the Pope of Rome.

3. The glorious title and state of real Christians, to be called 'elect'. It is an unspeakable mercy to be selected from the mass of so many thousands of the lost, from the communion of their guilt and punishment, from the power of unbelief, sin and seduction. Distinguish between "elect" and "called." Calling reveals the decree of election. The end of election in the New Testament differs from that in the Old.

4. The Christian's real home is heaven; here below we are guests and strangers, as David confesses: "I am both, thy pilgrim, (here below) and thy citizen (above)", Ps. xxxix. 18. [This is Luther's version, but it is doubtful whether the antithesis of *pilgrim* and *citizen* is warranted by the original Hebrew, תּוֹשָׁב is rather a *denizen* than a citizen; the Jews of the dispersion were *denizens*, not citizens.—M.]. The time of his sorrowful pilgrimage is brief, as contrasted with the eternal glory of his imperishable home. Ch. i. 4; v. 10; ii. 11. cf. Heb. xi. 13.

5. The call of Divine grace has its proper seasons and hours in nations as well as in individuals. According to Acts xvi. 6, 7, the Spirit forbade Paul and Timothy to preach in proconsular Asia and Bithynia, but soon after the hour of grace struck also for those provinces passed over at the first. On his return from Europe, Paul declared the word of the Lord Jesus to the Jews and Greeks in Asia by the space of two years, Acts xix. 10. He or other servants of Christ must have planted a Church in Bithynia.

6. The state of salvation of believers is not the result of some sudden manifestation of the loving will of God, sprung up in the course of time, but the effect of His eternal decree and fore-determination. It is a work participated in by the three persons of the Holy Trinity and redounding to their glory. God the Father elects unto salvation in Christ and prepares salvation; God the Son gives reality to election by His life, suffering and death; God the Holy Ghost appropriates and applies to the souls of penitent sinners the salvation procured by Jesus Christ.—He that places himself under the discipline of the Holy Ghost and suffers himself to form the resolution, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient," as Israel said of old, Ex. xxiv. 7, is mysteriously sprinkled with the blood of Christ, his sins are covered, he is regarded as pure and holy in Christ, and enabled to render priestly service to God and to be found without spot before Him, 1 Jno. i. 7. In the New Testament, spirit and blood appear to be intimately related to each other, Jno. vi. 53, etc., Rom. iii. 24, 25; viii. 1; 1 Jno. v. 6.

7. Peace is a glorious fruit of grace where it is received into the heart, cf. Rom. i. 7. The salutation of peace contains the sum-total of the gospel. Luther says: "Peace is the favour of God which now begins in us but must work more and more and multiply unto death. If a man knows and believes in a gracious God, he *has* Him; his heart finds peace, and he fears neither the world nor the devil, for he knows that God, who controls all things, is his friend, and will deliver him from death, hell and all calamity; therefore his conscience is full of peace and joy. This is what Peter desires for believers; it is a right Christian salutation, with which all Christians should greet one another."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The servants of Christ find consolation and protection in the fact that they are sent of the Lord. —The motto of Israelites indeed: "I am a guest on earth."—The sublime consolation to belong to God's elect people;—[to be a member of the Church, ἐκκλησία.—M.]. The reason of our election resides not in man but in the free grace of God.—The unmistakable tokens of election.—Sprinkling with the blood of Christ, the precious treasure of the elect.—The work of grace carried on by the Holy Trinity in the saint's heart.—The blessed end for which we are called.

STARKE:—Peter was an Apostle of Jesus Christ, but not the visible vicegerent of Christ on earth. —A true pastor cannot forget those whom he has begotten in Jesus Christ; if he is unable to comfort them orally, he does it by letter.—He who is

a stranger in a country needs not on that account be sad; it is enough that he has secured a fair heritage in Christ. The more he perceives this, the less will he be attached to the world and the more will he long for his heavenly fatherland.—In the election of grace the decree of God is not absolute, but it takes place because persevering faith in Jesus Christ is foreseen.—Grace and peace belong together, and must not be confounded with nature and assurance; grace brings peace and peace testifies of grace. None can desire any thing more precious than grace and peace; he that hath them is happy for time and for eternity.

CHAPTER I. 3–12.

Analysis:—God is praised for the grace of regeneration and for the hope of the heavenly inheritance, founded thereon. Sufferings should augment and intensify the Christian's joy, for they serve to prove his faith. The Spirit of Christ had directed the inquiries of the prophets to this end of hope, yea, even the angels were desirous of looking into this salvation.

3 Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his
abundant mercy hath [1]begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of
4 Jesus Christ from the dead,[2] To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and
5 that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you,[3] Who are kept [4]by the power
6 of God through faith [5]unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time. [6]Wherein
ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through
7 manifold temptations: That the [7]trial of your faith, being much more precious than
of gold that perisheth, though it be [8]tried with fire, might be found [9]unto praise
8 and honour and glory at the [10]appearing of Jesus Christ: Whom having not [11]seen,
ye love; in whom, though now ye see *him* not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy un-
9 speakable and full of glory:[12] [13]Receiving the end of your faith, *even* the salvation of
10 *your* souls. Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently,
11 who prophesied of the grace *that should come* unto you: Searching what, [14]or what
manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified
12 beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it
was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us[15] they did minister the things, which
are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the
Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into.

Verse 3. [1 *Regeneravit nos.*—Vulg.—M.]
[2 German:—"Who, according to His manifold mercy, hath begotten us again by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto a living hope."—M.]
[*Translate:* - - - - - - begat us again unto - - - - - - - through the resurrection, etc.—M.]
[Cod. Sin.—διὰ for δι'.—M.]

Verse 4. [3 Text. Rec. ἡμᾶς A. B. C. K. L., ὑμᾶς; so also most of the Versions.—M.]
[Cod. Sin.—ἀμάρ. κ. ἀμίαντ·—ἐν οὐράνῳ—M.]

Verse 5. [4 Guarded.—Gal. iii. 23.—M.]
[5 εἰς, till.—Acts iv. 3; Phil. i. 10; Gal. iii. 13, 24; 1 Thess. iv. 15; cf. also 2 Pet. ii. 4.—M.]
[Calvin:—*Quid juvat, salutem nobis in cœlo esse repositam, quum nos in mundo tanquam in turbulento mari jactemur? quid juvat, salutem nostram statui in tranquillo portu, quum inter mille naufragia fluctuemur? Praevenit Apostolus ejusmodi objectiones*, etc.—M.]
[Bengel: "*Hæreditas servata est; hæredes custodiuntur; neque illa his, neque hi deerunt illi. Corroboratio insignis.*"—M.]
[Aretius:—"*Militare est vocabulum* φρουρά: *præsidium. Pii igitur dum sunt in periculis, sciant totidem sis divinitus parata esse præsidia: millia millium custodeunt eos.*"—M.]
[Cod. Sin.—ἑτοίμως.—M.]
[German:—"Which is already prepared."—M.]

Verse 6. [6 ἐν ᾧ, "in the which tyme."—Tyndale.—M.]
[Cod. Sin.—*δέον without ἐστιν·—*λυπηθέντες.—M.]
[German:—"Whereat ye rejoice; who now, if it must be so, are for a little time (or a little) afflicted in manifold temptations."—M.]
[*Translate:*—"In which (time) ye rejoice, for a little time at present (Alford), if it must be so, having been afflicted, in. - - - - - - ."—M.]

Verse 7. [7 δοκίμιον probably=δοκιμασία, proof Jas. i. 3. Proof comes nearer the German than trial.—M.]
[8 δοκιμάζειν probare, whence the German *pruefen, erprobt*, and the English *prove*.—M.]
[German:—"That your faith in its proof may be found much more precious than perishable gold, which is also proved by fire, unto praise and honour and glory in the revelation," etc.—M.]
[Cod. Sin.—πολυτιμότερον.—δοκ. κ. τιμ.—M.]
[9 εἰς, resulting in. See Robinson s. v. εἰς 3. a.—M.]
[10 ἀποκαλύψει—in revelation. Vulg. Wicl.—M.]

Verse 8. [11 Lachmann and Tischend. ἰδόντες, but εἰδότες is also strongly supported.—M.]
[Cod. Sin., agrees with the former.—M.]
[12 *Laetitia glorificata*—Vulg., Germ., Wicl., Geneva, Alford. Triumphant joy.—Brown.—M.]

Verse 9. [[13] Receiving the end of your faith; rather, "*carrying off* the end of your faith".—M.]
[This is the sense of κομίζω in middle; see Liddell and Scott s. v. ii. 2.—*Reportantes*, Vulg.—M.]
Verse 10. [Cod. Sin.—ἐξηραύν. with A. B'.—M.]
Verse 11. [Cod. Sin.—ἐραυν. with B'.—M.]
[[14] *Quo et quali tempore.*—Jaspis. "In relation to whom and what time."—Purver.—M.]
Verse 12. [[15] ὑμῖν is the more authentic reading.—M.]
[ἡμῖν Rec. K. Syr. Copt. ὑμῖν A. B. C. L., Cod. Sin.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 3. The praise of the Divine grace in the glorious hope of Christians flows like a deep and wide stream from the full heart of the Apostle v. 3–12. Paul praises in similar language with one long breath of joy the salvation given unto us, Eph. i. 3–14. We have first the source and cause of our hope, v. 3, then its end and glory, v. 4, then the way we must take which ought not to make us hesitate v. 5–8, and lastly the means designed to encourage and strengthen us, v. 8–12.

Blessed be the God—Christ.—God is here blessed, as is frequently the case in the Epistles of Paul, not only as the Father but also as the God of Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 31; Rom. xv. 6; Eph. i. 3. 17; Col. i. 3; cf. John xx. 17. An important suggestion concerning the relation of the Logos to the Father. Only in Christ and through him do all find and possess God. The Paternity points to the eternal generation out of the Being of God, Ps. ii. 3; and to the intimate relation to the Incarnate Son. Weiss derives this doxological formula from, what may be called, the liturgical usage of the primitive Church, cf. Jas. i. 27; iii. 9. He thinks that said expression is insufficient as proof of the Essential Divinity and Preëxistence of Christ. Cf. on the other hand, Matt. xvi. 16; John vi. 68.

Mercy, ἔλεος (חֶסֶד) the compassionating love of God, which condescends to the low estate of the helpless, the weak, the impotent, the wretched and the sinful. It is a manifold mercy, a wonderful riches thereof (Rom. ii. 4) which appears from the multitude of its gifts of grace, from the depth of our misery, from the extent and diversity of its efforts of deliverance.

Begotten again, ἀναγεννήσας etc. cf. John iii. 3; Tit. iii. 5; James. i. 18; Col. iii. 1; Eph. ii. 10. He has kindled in us a new spiritual life by Holy Baptism and the influences of the Holy Spirit connected therewith, cf. Eph. i. 19. 20. He has laid the foundation of recreating us into His image. "He has made us other men in a far more essential sense than it was once said to Saul: 'Thou shalt be turned into another man' 1 Sam. x. 6." What is the principal fruit and end of this new generation? A living hope. Its object is not only our future resurrection (Grotius, Bengel, de Wette), but the whole plenitude of the salvation still to be revealed by Jesus Christ, even until the new heavens and the new earth shall appear, 2 Peter iii. 13. 14; Rev. xxi. 1. Birth implies life; so it is with the hope of believers, which is the very opposite of the vain, lost and powerless hope of the worldly-minded. It is powerful, and quickens the heart by comforting, strengthening, and encouraging it, by making it joyous and cheerful in God. Its quickening influence enters even into our physical life. 'Hope is not only the fulfilment of the new life, created in regeneration, but also the innermost kernel of the same.' Weiss.

By the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.—δι ἀναστάσεως, Calvin, Gerhard, Knapp, and Weiss join it to ἀναγενν.; it seems more natural to connect it with the immediately preceding ζῶσαν; so Œcumenius, Bengel, Steiger, Lachmann and de Wette. The life of this hope flows from the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. "If Christ had not risen from the dead, we should be without consolation and hope, and all the work and sufferings of Christ would be in vain." Luther. As surely as He has conquered death and entered upon a heavenly life of joy, so surely will those who are members of the Body, whereof He is Head, follow Him, even as we sing: Does the head forget its members, And not draw them after it?

VER. 4. **To an inheritance, incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away.**—Believers are strangers here on earth, but citizens in heaven; they have therefore in heaven a possession and an inheritance which infinitely excels the inheritance of God's ancient people in the land of Canaan. The heavenly inheritance (cf Matthew vi. 20; Luke xii. 33; x. 25; xviii 18; Mark x. 17) is (*a*) *incorruptible*. It is free alike from the germs of corruption and death, like all things earthly, even those which are seemingly most firm and indestructible, *e. g.* the precious metals, ch. i. 18. 23; cf. 1 John ii. 17. "Rust does not corrupt it, decay does not consume it, death does not destroy it." Besser. It comprehends union to Him, who only has immortality and is called 'the Eternal' 1 Tim. i. 17. How could it then be destroyed by any external power? It is (*b*) *undefiled* or *unblemishable*. The earth and the land of Canaan in particular were polluted by fearful bloodshedding and many other horrors. Lev. xviii. 27. 28; Numb. xxxv. 33. 34; Ezek. xxxvi. 17; Jer. ii. 7. Injustice, selfishness, hatred, envy and cunning cleave to temporal possessions. If gathered by avarice, they are compared to loathsome and thick mire, Hab. ii. 6. Every human body and every human soul is stained with hateful desires and mostly, also, with outward sin. All earthly joy is mingled with displeasure and sorrow. But the possessions of the life above are pure, clean and unstained, and nothing impure can attach itself to them. (*c*) '*It fadeth not away.*' *Here* the beauty of earthly nature is rapidly passing away, *there* reigns perpetual spring; *here* a hot wind may change the most blooming gardens into a wilderness, cf. ch. i. 24; Is. xl. 6; *there* no such alternation of blossoming and fading is found, but every thing remains in the beauty of imperishable bloom and verdure. Weiss sees in the three predicates a striking climax. He says that the first denotes the freedom of the heavenly possession from the germs of destructibility and transitoriness, which are inherent in all earthly things, that the second denies its ability to be polluted by outward sin, and the third even the alternation, which makes the beauty of earthly nature pass away at least

temporarily. ['Ἄφθαρτος *æternum durens;*—'Ἀμίαντος *purum—cui nihil mali, nihil vitii est admixtum—ut purum gaudium—gaudium cui nihil tristitiæ admiscetur.* 'Ἀμάραντος *non marcescens.* Morus.—M.]

Reserved in heaven, τετηρημένην. While here below in the strange country of our pilgrimage all possessions are insecure, the inheritance above is in the surest custody, for it is in the Almighty hand of God. As it has been designed and prepared for believers from everlasting, so it is perpetually kept; and believers, on the other hand, are kept for it, v. 5, so that they can in no wise lose it, cf. Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Matt. xxv. 34; John x. 28. τετηρ. implies both the certainty and present concealment of the heavenly inheritance. The figure is taken from parents who securely guard something for their children, and then surprise them with it.

VER. 5. **Who are kept by the power of God,** φρουρεῖν, a military term used of a guard for the protection of a place, or of a strongly garrisoned fortress. Fear not the enemies of your salvation, for you are surrounded by a strong, protecting body-guard, by the power of God and His holy angels, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 32; Phil. iv. 7; Song of Sol. iii. 7. 8; Zech. ii. 5; 2 Kings vi. 16. 17. Nothing short of Divine power is needed to protect us from so many strong and subtle enemies, as Peter made experience in his own case. Weiss with Steiger and de Wette explain it of the Holy Ghost. δύναμις Θεοῦ is certainly used in that sense, Luke i. 35, but πνεῦμα ἅγιον goes before. The other passages adduced by them are inconclusive. It seems therefore arbitrary to abandon the relation of the expression to the Omnipotence of God. On what condition do we enjoy that guard? Faith, whose object is not mentioned here in particular, and should be supplied from v. 8. It is the same means by which salvation is first procured, then constantly kept up, viz.: acknowledging Jesus as the Messiah and confidently surrendering to Him, which is not identical with obedience, but the source of it, cf. Acts iii. 16; x. 43; Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 34; Luke vii. 50.

Salvation ready, σωτηρία, יְשׁוּעָה *negatively,* deliverance from eternal destruction, and *positively,* introduction to the salvation prepared by Jesus, translation from the power of Satan, sin and death into the perfect life of liberty, righteousness and truth, Acts ii. 40; iv. 12; v. 31; xv. 11; 1 Peter i. 9; Matt. xvi. 25; Luke ix. 56. The former point is predominant as the latter lies rather in κληρονομία. With Peter σωτηρία appears in most intimate connection with the completion of salvation, chap. i. 9; iv. 17. 18; Acts ii. 21; 1 Peter ii. 2. How much he has it at heart is evident from his using the word three times in this section. He thinks of it not as far distant, but as close at hand, as he says in ch. iv. 5, "Who shall give account to Him that is *ready to judge the quick and the dead,*" cf. ch. iv. 7. Sharing the opinion of the other apostles concerning the nearness of Christ's Advent to judgment, he describes σωτηρία as ready to be revealed (James v. 7. 8; Rev. i. 3; xxii. 10. 20; Heb. x. 25. 37; Jude 18; 1 John ii. 18; Rom. xiii. 11. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 51; 2 Cor. v. 2. 3; Phil. iv. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 17). "The inheritance to which you are ordained, has been acquired long since and prepared from the beginning of the world, but lies as yet concealed, covered and sealed; but in a short time, it will be opened in a moment and disclosed, so that we may see it." Luther.

To be revealed, ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, denotes salvation fully disclosed, cf. ch. i. 7; iv. 13; v. 1. At ch. i. 13 it refers to the announcement of the first advent of Christ, cf. Rom. xvi. 25; and to inward revelation at 1 Cor. ii. 10; Gal. i. 16; iii. 23. **In the last time,** ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, in the completing period of salvation beginning with the return of Christ, this is elsewhere called συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, Matt. xiii. 39. 40; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20; or ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα John xi. 24; xii. 24; xii. 48. In Hebrew אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים Gen. xlix. 1; Num. xxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 30; Is. ii. 2; Mich. iv. 1; Ezek. xxxviii. 16; Dan. x. 14, where regard is had sometimes more to the beginning, sometimes more to the development of that period. The last times of the present system of the world, of the αἰὼν οὗτος are also called ἔσχαται ἡμέραι, 2 Tim. iii. 1; Jude 18; 1 Peter i. 20; 2 Peter iii. 3, or ἐσχάτη ὥρα, 1 John ii. 18; they border upon those συντέλεια, but do not coincide with them. Somewhat different appears the *usus loquendi* of the Ep. to the Hebrews (ch. ix. 26). But ἐπὶ συντέλειᾳ may be rendered, near to the period of completion, which the author thought immediately impending.

VER. 6. **Wherein ye greatly rejoice.**—'Εν ᾧ connect not with καιρός, but with the whole preceding sentence, verses 4 and 5. The thought of the great possessions reserved for you, justly fills you with exceeding joy. In this do not let yourselves be disconcerted by quickly passing sufferings of probation, which for your proof are necessary to the happiness of all Christians.

If need be.—Εἰ δέον supposes that the afflictions will not be of uninterrupted continuance and that their duration and measure have been decreed by the wisdom of God, and that they will not be continued one minute longer than is needful for us. Believers also need them in exact adjustment to the degree to which their nature remains as yet uncleansed of the poison of sin.

In heaviness through manifold temptations.—Sufferings cause to the outer man pain and grief, Heb. xii. 11, while the inner man can rejoice in them.

ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς; πειρασμ. relates to afflictions differing in kind, sent or permitted by God as trials or tests of the reality of the Christian's religious principles, as exercising his patience and developing his desire after heavenly things. Among the peculiar temptations to which believers who had left Judaism were exposed, we may mention the contempt and abuse they met at the hands of their former coreligionists, the temporal losses to which they had to submit and the efforts of false teachers to induce them to deny the truth and to effect a mixture of Judaism and Christianity. Cf. Heb. x. 32; Jas. i. 2; Acts viii. 1; xv. 1; xiv. 22; 1 Thess. iii. 2 etc.; 2 Cor. xi. 23.

VER. 7. **That the trial of your faith.**—*End* of the temptations v. 7: The splendour and preciousness of faith is to shine with a brilliancy

inversely proportioned to their darkness [*i. e.* of the temptations, M.] Faith must be tested by temptations which are consequently unable to mar the joy of our hope in Christ.

Τὸ δοκίμιον τῆς πίστεως. *δοκίμιον* signifies proof-stone, proof, tried integrity. Here it can only be taken in the last sense. The proof of faith=faith abiding the proof or test, or faith verified by trial, cf. James i. 3. In the Old Testament, the proof or trial of faith is frequently compared to the trial of gold by the process of smelting or refining by fire, Job xxiii. 10; Ps. lxvi. 10; Jer. ix. 7; Zech. xiii. 9; Mal. iii. 2. Gold is the most precious metal, but faith is even more precious; as gold is tried, proved and refined by fire, so faith must be proved and refined by the fire of temptations. As the heat of fire separates dross from gold, so all alloy must be separated from faith, all self-reliance on our own wisdom or strength, all dependence on the help of the creature,—*ἀπόλλυμ.* Think of *consumitur annulus usu.* [Ignatius, a successor of Peter at Antioch, calls his chains "spiritual pearls." Cyprian, speaking of the dress of virgins, says, that when Christian women suffer martyrdom with faith and courage, then their sufferings are like *pretiosa monilia*, costly bracelets. See Wordsworth *in loco*, who notices the following passage from Hermas, Pastor i. 4, p. 440, ed. Dressel: "*Aurea pars vos estis; sicut enim per ignem aurum probatur, et utile fit, sic et vos probamini; qui igitur permanserint et probati fuerint, ab eis purgabuntur; et sicut aurum emendatur et remittit sordem suam, sic et vos abjicietis omnem tristitiam* (*ὀλίγον λυπηθέντες*) *et emendabimini instructuram turris.*—M."] *εὑρεθῇ* already now, since often the enemies of truth are constrained to acknowledge such fidelity of faith, innocence and patience, but more in the last days and in the great day of Christ. Matt. xxv. 23; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Heb. xii. 11; James i. 12; Rev. ii. 8–10.

Unto praise and honour—Jesus Christ.—*Εἰς ἔπαινον κ. τ. λ.* The reward of grace which the elect shall receive at the return of Christ consists of (*a*) the *praise* of their fidelity of faith, cf. Matt. xxv. 21; 1 Cor. iv. 5; Rom. ii. 7. 10; 2 Thess. i. 5; (*b*) the *honour* which Christ promises to His faithful servants and shows to them, in fact, by the honourable position to which He promotes them, John xii. 26; cf. 1 Sam. ii. 30; Rev. xxii. 4; iii. 21; (*c*) of the *glory*, which the Father has given to Christ, ch. i. 11. 21; Acts iii. 13; and which He will communicate to all that are His, ch. iv. 13; v. 1; iv. 14. *τιμή* and *δόξα* occur often conjointly in Paul's writings, 1 Tim. i. 17; Rom. ii. 7. 10; Heb. ii. 7. 9. The future glory affecting alike the soul and the body (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 43–49; Phil. iii. 21,) appears as the end of the whole work of redemption, (Rom. ix. 23; 2 Cor. iii. 18; 1 Cor. ii. 7), and therefore as the main object of Christian hope, Rom. v. 2; Col. i. 27. The effulgency of God will hereafter shine out of all believers, because they hold the most intimate communion with the glorified Jesus. The completion of the elect shall also redound to the praise, honour and glory of God Himself, cf. Rev. iv. 11; v. 12. 13. The object is probably not mentioned designedly.—'*Ἐν ἀποκαλ.* *vide* v. 5.

Ver. 8. **Whom having not seen—full of glory.**—For the confirmation of their hope the Apostle after having mentioned the name of Jesus, continues in allusion to John xx. 29: whom although you have not known by face, yet you love. The relation you sustain to Him is that of the heart. The simplest construction of *εἰς ὃν* is to connect it with *ἀγαλλ.*, in expectation of whom, and because of whom you greatly rejoice. The present and the future are intertwined. *χαρᾷ δεδοξασμένῃ* in contrast with the idle and vain joy of the world, denotes a joy from which are separated all impure and obscuring elements, which according to the explanation of Steinmeyer and Weiss, contains glory in the germ, by which the future glory irradiates already the earthly life of Christians, and which anticipates, as it were, the future glory. Roos: "Joy clothed in glory."

Ver. 9. **Receiving the end of your faith,** *κομιζόμενοι.* Living hope regards the future as the present. The word is used of competitors in the games, who, upon proving victorious, carry off presents or prizes.—*τὸ τέλος*, the end to which competitors in the Christian race aspire, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 24 etc.; 2 Tim. iv. 7. 8; Heb. xii. 1.—The salvation of the soul is the end of faith and the reward of grace, given to the Christian at the completion of the contest, cf. Acts xv. 11; 1 Peter i. 5.

Ver. 10. **Of which salvation—grace that should come unto you.**—Connection: This salvation increases in importance and preciousness, if we consider that the prophets did with the utmost eagerness inquire into the means and time of salvation, and that even the happy angels desired to have an insight of this mystery. How happy are we to whom is revealed, what was concealed from them! *ἐκζητεῖν*, to make most diligent and zealous inquiry into a thing and to regard it from every point of view. *ἐξερευνᾷν*=כָּרָה, חָקַר, used of miners engaged in digging for precious metals in the bowels of the earth. They have searched with a diligence like that displayed in the mining of gold and silver, cf. Job xxviii. 15–19; Prov. iii. 14–18. *περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος.* They did prophesy of the saving grace, which by the life, the sufferings and the death of Christ has risen upon a sinful world (the whole world of sinners). This grace is no longer represented to you by various types, but has become real. Cf. John i. 17.

Ver. 11. **What, or what manner of time—glory that should follow.**—*Εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρόν.* Their inquiries were not only of a general character, how many years would have to elapse to the advent of the Messiah, but had also particular reference to the peculiar condition and characteristics of that time and to the relations of the Jewish people to foreign powers. *τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πν. Χριστοῦ.* The explanation, 'the spirit testifying of Christ,' which is even found in Bengel, is inadmissible on grammatical grounds. Perhaps it may be conceived as follows: The same Spirit of God, the Messianic Spirit, who in the course of time operated in the person of Christ, revealed himself in the prophets; *sic* Schmid II., de Wette, Weiss. But more simple and natural appears the ancient interpretation, that it was the spirit belonging to the preëxisting Messiah from eternity, and which He was conse-

quently able to impart to the prophets. Thus the preëxisting Messiah is mentioned at 1 Cor. x. 4. 9. Weiss quotes Barnabas (Ep. 5 Hefele *patres apost. Opp. ed.* 3, 1847,): *prophetæ ab ipso habentes donum prophetarunt*, and Calvin: *veteres prophetias a Christo ipso dictatas*, cf. v. 20; John xii. 41; Col. i. 17.—*τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήμ.* Sufferings in store for, waiting for Christ.—*τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας*, sufferings and glory are thus connected, Luke xxiv. 26; cf. Matt. xvi. 21. It is a treasure of glories, of which Christ has taken possession and which will be fully revealed at the marriage of the Lamb, Rev. xix. 7.

Ver. 12. **Unto whom—look into.** *'Αποκαλ.* relates to the communication of things new, and previously unknown, cf. Matt. x. 26; Rom. i. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 13. *ὅτι—αὐτά.* sc. *παθημ. κ. δοξ.* should be treated as a parenthesis in answer to the question, Why were those things revealed to them, seeing they were not permitted to realize their fulfilment? It was not done for their sake, but for ours; they were thereby to minister unto us.—*εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς*, who have evangelized you, brought you the glad tidings. From this it may be inferred that others besides Peter had first preached the Gospel to those Christians, at all events that he was not their only teacher.—*ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐραν.* cf. Luke xxiv. 49; Acts ii. 2, etc.; Gal. iv. 6; John xv. 26. While in the Old Testament we frequently meet with the expression that the Spirit fell on the prophets, Ezek. viii. 1; xi. 5; denoting the suddenness, the passing and overpowering nature of His influence, He is in the New Testament said *to be sent.*—*παρακύψαι* properly to stand by and stoop down, in order to examine something very closely, to look at something with the countenance bent down. The salvation, revealed by Jesus Christ, contains a wealth of thoughts and ideas that is unfathomable even to the angels, cf. James i. 25; Eph. iii. 10. Their looking into has already begun and is still continuing. This is indicated by the Aorist. [Wordsworth: This high and holy mystery which represents the angels themselves bending over the Word of God enshrined in the Ark of the Church, was symbolized by the figures of the Cherubim of Glory spreading their wings, and bending their faces, and shadowing the Mercy-seat, in the Holy of Holies, upon the Ark, in which were kept the Tables of the Law written by God (Ex. xxv. 18–22; Heb. ix. 4. 5); and by the side of which was the Pentateuch. Deut. xxxi. 24–26.—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

(1). The circumstance that the first person in the Godhead is described as the God and Father of Jesus Christ, points indisputably to a certain dependence of the Being of Christ on the Father, not only with respect to the humanity of our Lord, but, also, with respect to His Divine nature. Thus Christ called the Father His God, even after His resurrection, Jno. xx. 17; Rev. iii. 12; ii. 7. With this agree the expressions of the Apostles, Eph. i. 17; Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Col. i. 3. Where the three supreme names are mentioned together, the Father only is called God by emphasis, 1 Pet. i. 1. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 4–6; iii. 23; xi. 3; Rev. i. 4–6. Nevertheless, the Scriptures teach us firmly to maintain the true Divinity of Christ, although, the *quo modo* of such simultaneous equality and dependence of Being transcends our powers of comprehension. The filial relation among men affords, however, an analogy. [Cf. the following section of the Athanasian Creed:—"*Sed necessarium est ad æternam Salutem, ut Incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat. Est ergo Fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur, quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus pariter et Homo est. Deus est ex Substantia Patris ante secula genitus: Homo ex Substantia Matris in secula natus. Perfectus Deus, perfectus Homo ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens. Æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem: Minor Patre secundum Humanitatem. Qui licet Deus sit et Homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus. Unus autem, non conversione Divinitatis in Carnem, sed adsumtione Humanitatis in Deum. Unus omnino, non confusione Substantiæ, sed unitate Personæ. Nam sicut Anima rationalis et Caro unus est Homo; ita Deus et Homo unus est Christus.*" Fides Catholica vv. 27–35. —M.]

(2). As corporeal life presupposes birth, so does spiritual life, Jno. iii. 3, and just as man is unable to beget and bring forth himself into physical and earthly life, so his spiritual generation and new-birth are equally independent of himself.

(3). As there are two men in every true Christian, a new man and an old one, so heaviness in manifold temptation and rejoicing may readily co-exist, v. 6.

(4). Our Lord's return has been one of the fundamental articles of the faith of universal Christendom in every age of the Church's history. To hide this important doctrine under a bushel, is at once a defect of teaching and in opposition to the mind of Christ and His apostles, v. 7. It is to be noticed that the return of Christ shall be preceded, not only by several ages, but also, by several ends of ages, with typical final judgments, as St. Paul speaks of *τέλη τῶν αἰώνων*. The flood, the dispersion of the ten tribes, the judgment on Judah, but especially the destruction of Jerusalem and the conquest of Palestine, were in a certain sense such final judgments, cf. 1 Cor. x. 11.

(5). Verses 10–12, afford us an insight into the mode of prophetic inspiration, and into the relation of the Divine influence and the free mental activity of the prophets. They met, as it were, the Spirit of God with their earnest longings for salvation; the Spirit communicated to them the main burden of prophecy; while the time and details of the beginning of salvation were left to their researches and inquiries. They made a free appropriation of what the Spirit had disclosed to them, and sought to apply it to time and circumstances.

[The Scripture *facts* on the subject of inspiration are as follows: the subjects of inspiration were permitted to make diligent and faithful research (Luke i. 1–4), to clothe the same thought in different language (cf. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27; Luke xxii. 19. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 24. 25; also Matt. iii. 17; Mk. i. 11; Luke iii. 22), give distinctive colouring to their accounts; according to the circumstances that grouped round their individuality (compare the

character and early associations of the four Evangelists, as well as the scope of each Gospel, compare, also, the style of Ezekiel and Isaiah, of John and Paul), to cite other inspired authorities (Ps. cviii. and Ps. lvii. 7–11; lx. 5–12, etc.), to use uninspired documents (Josh. x. 13; Numb. xxi. 14; Jude ix. 14, 15), they sometimes were uncertain of the precise meaning and application of their message (1 Pet. i. 10–12; Dan. xii. 8, etc.), and their message was delivered in *language* approved by the Divine Spirit (1 Pet. i. 10. 11; Dan. xii. 8; 2 Tim. iii. 16; Heb i. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 12. 13), see Angus's *Bible Handbook*, §§ 146–150, for a brief account of Inspiration. "Inspiration is such an immediate and complete *discovery* by the Holy Spirit, to the minds of the sacred writers, of those things which could not have otherwise been known, and such an effectual *superintendence* as to those matters which they might have been informed of by other means—as entirely preserved them from error in every particular, which could in the least affect any of the doctrines or precepts contained in their books." *Scott's Essays.*—M.]

(6). Since, according to v. 11, the Spirit of Christ wrought in the prophets, the prophetical writings must possess an authority not inferior to the testimony of Christ in the New Testament. Both Testaments contain one and the same principle of revelation, one kernel and centre; but while the Old Testament is only the threshold and fore-testimony of the New Testament, the New Testament is the end and fulfilment of the Old.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Christianity is essentially a life of hope—it is founded on living hope. The eye of faith looks out for the glorious revelation of Jesus Christ from heaven, for the first resurrection, for the heavenly city of peace (Jerusalem), for the precious inheritance, for the new heaven and the new earth.—He that has become conscious of his sinfulness and manifold bondage and has fixed his eye on the heavenly treasure, must needs celebrate the praises of God.—Without regeneration there is no partaking of the heavenly inheritance.—Nothing short of Divine power is sufficient to keep us unto salvation.—The hope of faith is the root out of which grows the fruit of a spiritual joy, serene and triumphant over pain.—When the Christian contemplates the glorious fruit and its consequences, he can rejoice at what most deeply pains the children of this world.

The mystery of afflictions and temptations in believers.—The solution of the riddle lies in their scope—proof, separation from dross, exercise and purification.—The world's joy never comes up to the terms in which its praises are published in speech or in song, while the opposite holds good of Christian joy.—What must be the character of such as desire to be partakers of the kingdom of Christ?—Disparity and similarity in the disposition and situation of believers of the Old and New Testaments.—The sweet harmony of the prophets in their predictions of Christ.—The Holy Ghost the best Teacher.

The words of Jesus and the Apostles a precious key to the right understanding of prophecy.—If the angels greatly desire to look into the mysteries of the plan of salvation, who are represented by the Cherubim on the mercy-seat, how much more highly ought we to prize the knowledge of salvation in Christ!

STARKE:—Would you give the consolation of v. 3–9 for an empire? If the hope be living, the inheritance is sure, viz., the crown that never fades, the treasure that none can steal. Abide the heat. How short is suffering—how long the glittering eternity! Heavenly life God will give above, evermore my heart shall praise Him.

HEDINGER:—Regeneration is solely the work of God all-merciful, who helps the wretched from a spiritual death to spiritual life.—Children and friends inherit our goods; those therefore who desire to receive the heavenly inheritance must be the children and friends of God, Rom viii. 16. 17.—If you find this present time sorrowful and anxious, have patience; in the world you shall have tribulation: look joyfully forward to the last time that shall put an end to all grief, and bring you eternal glory.—God knows best what medicine He has to use for and what burdens He has to lay on each, in order to kill the old Adam.—As gold is the most precious metal, so faith is the most noble of the manifold gifts in the kingdom of grace, and as much passes for faith without being it, so the cross decides its genuineness.—The sum-total of the doctrine of Christ treats of His humiliation and exaltation. For Christ had to drink of the brook and therefore shall He lift up His head, Ps. cx. 7; suffer and enter into glory.—If any be bowed down with grief, let him take comfort from the example of Christ and the words of the Apostle: suffering first, glory after. The reverse takes place among the children of this world, with them joy comes first, and then grief, 2 Tim. ii. 12; Lk. vi. 25.—KAPFF:—What is genuine faith? 1. A birth out of (emanating from) God; 2. an assurance of what is unseen; 3. an inheritance of eternal life.—LISCO:—*Christian hope;* (*a*) its foundation; (*b*) its object; (*c*) its power; (*d*) its glorious reward.—*Eternal salvation:* (*a*) it was the object of the longing of the holy prophets; (*b*) it is made to depend on a certain order; (*c*) it is announced to all as existing.—*The blessedness of Christian hope;* (*a*) it flows from mercy; (*b*) it is the most precious of all possessions; (*c*) nothing can pluck it from us. *What is the glorious goal which the children of the kingdom go forth to meet?* (*a*) This goal is the heavenly inheritance; (*b*) it is founded on the mercy of God; (*c*) the way to it, persevering faith, is not without manifold tribulation; (*d*) it was the object of the longing of all the saints of old.—*The living hope to which we Christians are born again, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead;* 1. its preciousness in respect of its cause, object and influence; 2. its certainty; (*a*) the love and faith of the members of Christ; (*b*) from the declarations of the prophets and evangelists. *The Christian's gladness in sadness;* 1. because of the life of regeneration; 2. because of his inheritance; 3. because of Divine protection; 4. because of suffering; 5. because of future joy.—STAUDT.

[Vv. 3. 4. 1. The Christian's *title* to the heavenly inheritance—*begotten again;* 2. his *assurance* of it—a *lively hope;* 3. the immediate *cause* of both—Jesus Christ. 4. The *source*—*the abundant*

mercy of God.—A living hope; the world's highest motto is '*dum spiro spero*,' the Christian may add '*dum expiro spero!*'—Abundant mercy. Great sins and great miseries need *great* mercy, and many sins and many miseries need *many* mercies. (Bernard).—Love will stammer rather than be dumb.—v. 5. "Salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks;" what more safe than to be walled with *salvation* itself? cf. Prov. xviii. 10.—v. 6. The battle tries the soldier, the storm the pilot.—Christian militant—*dignum Deo spectaculum.*—v. 7. An unskillful beholder may think it strange to see gold thrown into the fire and left there for a time; but he that puts it there, would be loath to lose it; his purpose is to make some costly piece of work of it; every believer gives himself to Christ, and He undertakes to present him blameless unto the Father; not one of them shall be lost, nor one drachm of faith; they shall be found, and their faith shall be found, when He appears. That faith that is here in the furnace, shall be then made up into a crown of pure gold, *it shall be found unto praise and honour and glory.*—v. 8. The sun seems less than the wheel of a chariot; but reason teaches the philosopher that it is much larger than the whole earth; and the cause why it seems so little is its great distance. The naturally wise man is as far deceived by this carnal reason in his estimate of Jesus Christ, the Sun of righteousness, and the cause is the same, his great distance from Him, cf. Ps. x. 5.—"If I have any possessions, health, credit, learning, this is all the contentment I have of them, that I have somewhat I may despise for Christ, who is *totus desiderabilis et totum desiderabile.*" Greg Nazian. Orat. 1.—There is an inseparable intermixture of love with belief. If you ask, how shall I do to *love*, I answer, *believe.* If you ask, how shall I *believe?* I answer, *love.*—Joy unspeakable.—It were a poor thing if he that hath it, could tell it all out. (*Pauperis est numerare pecus*). And when the soul has most of it, then it remains most within itself, and is so inwardly taken up with it that it can then least of all express it. It is with joys, as they say of cares and griefs, *leves loquuntur, ingentes stupent.* The deepest waters run stillest. True joy is a solid, grave thing (*Res severa est verum gaudium.* Sen.), dwells more in the heart than in the face; whereas base and false joys are but superficial, skin-deep (as we say); they are all in the face.—*Lauda mellis dulcedinem quantum potes, qui non gustaverit, non intelliget.*—Aug.—v. 12. The true preachers of the gospel, though their ministerial gifts are for the use of others, yet that salvation they preach, they lay hold on and partake of themselves, as your boxes wherein perfumes are kept for garments and other uses, are themselves perfumed by keeping them! From LEIGHTON by M.]

CHAPTER I. 13–21.

ANALYSIS:—Exhortations to firmness and sobriety, to holiness in mind and conversation, to filial reverence of God,—all founded on love and gratitude for the precious redemption by the blood of Christ.

13 [1]Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end
14 for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ; [2]As
obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your
15 ignorance: [3]But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner
16,17 of conversation; [4]Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy. [5]And if ye
call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every
18 man's work, pass the time of your sojourning *here* in fear: [6]Forasmuch as ye know
that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, *as* silver and gold, from your vain
19 conversation *received* by tradition from your fathers[7]; But with the precious blood
20 of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot: [8]Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, [9]but was manifest in these last times for
21 you, Who by him do believe in God,[10] that raised him up from the dead, and gave
him glory; [11]that your faith and hope might be in God.

Verse 13. [1 German:—Wherefore with the loins of the mind girded and with soberness of spirit, fix all your hope on the grace which is being brought to you in the revelation of Jesus Christ.—M.]
[*Translate*:—Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, being sober, and hope perfectly for the grace which is being - - - - .—M.]
Verse 14. [2 Children of obedience, so Greek. German.—M.]
Verse 15. [3 But after the pattern of that Holy One.—de Wette, Alford.—M.]
[4 Conversation=behaviour.—M.]
Verse. 16. [Cod. Sin. ℵ10.—ἔσεσθαι διότι for γένεσθε ὅτι of Text. Rec.,—omits εἰμί.—M.]
Verse 17. [5 And if ye call upon as Father, Him, etc., so German after the Greek.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. *ἀναστρεφόμενοι.—M.]
Verse 18. [6 Knowing that.—M.]
[7 Out of your vain conversation, delivered to you from your fathers (Alford), inherited from the fathers, German.—M.]
Verse 20. [8 Who *indeed*, instead of, Who verily.—M.]
[9 But was manifested.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. *ἀνεγνώσω.—ἔσχατοι τοῦ χρόνου.—(**τῶν χρόνων)—M.]
Verse 21. [10 Who *through* Him believe *on* God.—M.]
[11 So that your faith and hope are on God.—M.]
[German:—So that your faith may also become hope in God.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. *ἐγείροντ.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 13. **Wherefore,** Διό refers to all the preceding account of the possession (by grace) of the elect. The New Testament state of grace is mainly designed to beget a perfect hope in the future consummation and perfecting of salvation. This hope essentially facilitates the full use of salvation with a view to holiness, to which exhortation is made in v. 14, etc. In v. 13, hope should be regarded as the central and leading idea, the other exhortations being added as participles. The object of that hope is the grace, which manifests itself in σωτηρία, in perfect salvation. The preposition ἐπί does not indicate the ground and strength of hope as Steiger and Weiss maintain, for it is not contrary to the New Testament *usus loquendi* to connect ἐπί with the object, cf. 1 Tim. v. 5; Acts ix. 42; xi. 17; xxii. 19; Winer, 5th edition, p. 241; 1 Jno. iii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 10; Acts xxiv. 15.—Join τελείως not with νήφοντες but with ἐλπίσατε. The hope existing in its first beginnings shall become so firm, that no suffering shall be able to shake it, and that it shall embrace whatever it contains in itself, and that it shall ever continue to the end. [*ita, ut nihil desideretur.*—Wahl.—M.]

For the grace—brought to you.—Ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν. The proper meaning of this expression depends on the interpretation of ἐν ἀποκαλύψει. The verb ἀποκαλύπτειν occurs indeed in a wider sense, to denote the revelation of the truth to the mind, or that of Jesus Christ, Matt. xi. 25; xvi. 17; Lk. x. 21; Gal. i. 16; iii. 23; 1 Cor. ii. 10. Hence ἀποκαλύψις μυστηρίου Rom. xvi. 25; and several times ἀποκαλύψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. It is applied to inward revelation as contrasted with human instruction, Gal. i. 12; Rev. i. 1; cf. Eph. i. 17; iii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 1. But ἡ ἀποκαλύψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ without the article, and without further specification, is the constant expression denoting the visible return of Christ. It is never used of His first advent in the flesh, cf. ch. i. 7, iv. 13; v. 1; 2 Thess. i. 7; Rom. viii. 18. 19; 1 Cor. i. 7. Particularly decisive are v. 5 and v. 7, where the reference is evidently to the second advent of Christ in the flesh. So Œcum. Theophylact, Grotius, Carpzov, Starke and others. It is difficult to combine both ideas, viz.: an inward and an outward revelation (Calvin, Beza, Bengel), and a clear sense possible only on the consideration that the revelation or advent of Christ to judgment is necessarily both inward and outward. The Apostle sees the advent of Christ as nearly impending, indeed as already present, ch. iv. 7; i. 20, and consequently speaks of grace, not as to be brought unto them hereafter, but as already brought to them [even now bearing down upon them.—M.]. In this sense φέρειν is used in the LXX. at Gen. xxxiii. 11. Hence it is unnecessary to assume a confusion of the present and future tenses.—χάρις in the usual sense, not=χάρισμα, as Grotius maintains. The objection of Weiss that the general biblical representation makes the second advent of Christ not a second revelation of grace, but a revelation of righteous judgment, ch. iv. 5; Rom ii. 5, is met by clear passages, *e. g.* Lk. xxi. 28. To the ungodly it will be a day of terror, but to believers a day of honour and glory. Then, at the appearing of Christ, it will become manifest, what is meant by being in favour (by standing in grace) with God, Mal. iv. 2. It has already been announced to you by the prophets (verse 12) but by Christ it is laid at your door, yea, laid in your bosom.

Gird up—sober.—Ἀναζωσάμενοι—νήφοντες. The perfect hoping is more clearly defined and confirmed by two participial additions. The first exhorts to girding up the loins. Peter thinks doubtless of the words of Jesus, "Let your loins be girded about," Luke. xii. 25 and with a view to avoiding all misunderstanding, adds, "the loins of your mind." Perhaps he alludes also to the significant commandment, "With your loins girded" Ex. xii. 11; and in that case the explanation of the addition is more simple and evident, cf. Jer. i. 17; Eph. vi. 14.—The loins were girded by gathering the long folds of the wide under-garment in a girdle in order to supply the body with a firm stay and to remove all hinderances, when the object was to work, to set out on a jourdey, to run, to carry a burden, to wrestle or to go to war. So the Christian should gird the διάνοια, gather up all distractedness and fickleness, and be astir and ready, that is, his thoughts and his will should be alive and concentrated when there is a call for work, for fight and for suffering. Beware of distractedness and idleness, but also of irritation, morbid excitement and exaggeration and eccentricity. Sobriety is to be the preventive of the latter. Both the girding and the sobriety are to be taken figuratively, although sobriety of the body is taken for granted. Compare the exhortation at Luke xxi. 34, and Rom. xiii. 14. Elsewhere sobriety is joined with vigilance that shall ward off all sleepiness and indolence, 1 Thess. v. 6; 1 Pet. v. 8; sometimes it occurs, as here, alone, 1 Thes. v. 8; 2 Tim. iv. 5; 1 Pet. iv. 7. [*Mentis sobrietas et vigilantia requiritur, sicque metaphora in lumborum cinctura prius reposita* ἐξηγετικῶς *explicatur.* Gerhard. '*Non temperantiam solum in cibu et potu commendat, sed spiritualem potius sobrietatem, quum sensus omnes nostros continemus, ne se hujus mundi illecebris inebrient.*'—Calvin.—M.] The hope of Christians might become mixed up with foolish and fanatical fancies of the glories of a temporal Messianic kingdom and premature expectations of the same as in the case of the Thessalonians (cf. 1 Thess. v. 6. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 2, etc.) against which the Apostle wishes to warn them. The present tense denotes necessary endurance in sobriety, while the Aorists ἐλπίσατε and ἀναζωσάμενοι concentrate the lasting action, as it were into one moment and denote them to depend upon one principal act.

VER. 14. **As children of obedience.**—Who sets his hopes in grace alone acquires the impulse and ability to fulfil the commandment of holiness. The exhortation proper is contained in v. 15. The contrary of children of obedience, are children of disobedience, in whom the devil is working, Eph. ii. 2; v. 6; Col. iii. 6; who are consequently called children of wrath, Eph. ii. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 14. Obedience comprises here, as in ch. i. 2. both the willing reception of the word of God and subjection to its precepts. Children of light, Eph. v. 8, are such as are born out of light and into light, with the property and calling

to shine as lights; so children of faith are such as are born out of faith and into the life of faith and obedience. Our heavenly Father is their begetter, ch. i. 3. 17, and assurance of faith coupled with obedience their mother, while on the other hand the devil is the father of unbelievers Jno. viii. 44; and evil concupiscence their mother. Ὡς denotes the reason, because you are children of obedience, cf. v. 19; ch. ii. 13; iv. 16. [τέκνα ὑπακοῆς. "This phraseology," says Winer, Gram., 6th ed. p. 252, "is to be attributed to the vivid imagination of Orientals, which represents mental and moral derivation or dependence under the form of son or child. Sir. iv. 11. *Children of disobedience* are those who are related to ἀπείθεια as a child to a mother, those in whom disobedience has become predominant and a second nature."—M.]

Not fashioning—ignorance.—The exhortation to holiness is now more clearly defined by reference to their ante-Christian state. As Christians, you dare not pursue a course that is in unison with your former walk in sinful lusts. συσχηματίζεσθαι (from σχῆμα, the form of a thing, the fashion and mode of life, the manner in which one appears) to form or fashion one's self after something, to conform to it, Rom. xii. 12; to make oneself like to, cf. ch. viii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 22. *Lusts* are not sensual impulses and wants only, but desires of what is different from what God allows, desires of evil comprehensively described by John (1 John ii. 16) as the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye and the pride of life; cf. Gal. v. 19 etc. They include, also, the proud aims of ambition, of the lust of power and of the desire of knowledge. The lusts are more clearly defined by '*in your ignorance.*' Sin darkens the understanding by the cloud of prejudices and false notions, cf. Rom. i. 21; Eph. iv. 18; and ignorance on the other hand, is the mother of many sins. A hint might be found in the circumstance that the Epistle is addressed to former heathens, who were devoid of all clear moral consciousness, of all definite discrimination between good and evil, between right and wrong; but the Jews also are charged with ignorance as the reason of their rejecting Christ, Acts. iii. 17, etc., and the degree to which their moral consciousness had been confused and clouded by the tenets of the Sanhedrim, is well known. This passage therefore is not decisive. In the case of believers, lusts belong to the past, inasmuch as their power is virtually broken and the spirit has the supremacy, although it must ever contend with the law in their members.

Ver. 15. **But according to the pattern of that Holy One who hath called you.**—What is in the heart must appear in the life. Conform not to your former lusts but aspire after conformity to the Holy God; συσχηματιζόμενοι may be understood; so *Œcumenius* and *Theophylact*. Calling is closely connected with election, being the realization and assurance of it. It takes place sometimes mediately sometimes immediately; its end is the light and salvation of God out from the darkness, ch. ii. 21. If God calls, it is man's duty to hear and to follow, cf. 1 Sam. iii. 10. Thus he becomes, by constant yielding, a child of obedience. Weiss sees in the reference to the Holy God a hint of the Old Testament character of the Epistle, but this is not conclusive *per se*. The Aorist Imperative denotes an action that is to take place *immediately*, cf. Winer, Gram. 6th ed. p. 329.

All manner of conversation, in all your behaviour toward God and your neighbour. [*Nulla sit pars vitæ quæ, non hunc bonum sanctitatis odorem redoleat.* Calv.—M.]

Ver. 16. **Because it is written.**—διότι gives the reason why holiness is necessary. For γένεσθε, Lachmann and Tischendorf read ἔσεσθε. The end and aim of believers is the same in the New Testament and in the Old Testament, although the ways are different. Man's holiness is effected by his participating in the holiness of God in Christ, Heb. xii. 10; Lev. xx. 8.

And if ye call upon as Father Him. *If*, does not denote doubt, but the necessary consequence of the one from the other. [*Si non dubitantis est, sed supponentis rem notam. Est enim omnium renatorum communis oratio, Pater noster qui es in cœlis.* Estius.—M.] You ought not to regard God as your Father nor call upon Him as such in the Lord's Prayer, if you will not walk before Him in holy fear. The exhortation to a holy conversation is parallel to a conversation in the fear of God; both are founded on the filial relation. ἐπικαλεῖσθε may mean simply to call or to call upon or pray to. Gerhard recognized already a reference to the Lord's Prayer. If you confess before the world in your prayer that God is at once your Father and Judge, then . . .; cf. ch. i. 14; ii. 2; Matt. v. 45. 48; Luke vi. 35. In the Old Testament God is called the Father of Israel on account of the peculiar covenant-relation, into which He had entered with Israel, Mal. ii. 10; i. 6; Deut. xxxii. 6; cf. 2 Sam. vii. 14. The Apostle doubtless thinks here of Mal. i. 6 etc. where a similar condition is found, where God's relation of Father and Master is made the reason of an exhortation to reverence, where at v. 8 and 9 the question is twice asked, "Will He regard your persons?" and where ch. ii. 2, the judicial revelation of God is mentioned, cf. ii. 9; x. 12; iii. 5. 18; [S. Barnabas, Ep. 4; "*Meditemur timorem Dei, Dominus non accepta personâ judicat mundum; unusquisque secundum quod facit accipiet.*—M.]

Who without respect of persons—work. πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν—נָשָׂא פָנִים, Luke xx. 21 is to regard the person, to take cognizance of outward relations, to make injurious distinction between rich and poor, the talented and the untalented, high and low, citizens and strangers, James ii. 4. God judges very differently; He looks at the heart and the character of men and at their exhibition in deeds. Justification at the last-judgment depends upon the inward state and the outward works of believers and unbelievers. So taught *our Lord* Himself, Matt. xvi. 27; vii. 19; xxv. 31 etc.; and with this agree John, Rev. xxii. 12; 7.: iii. 11; *John* ch. viii. 51; cf. ch. xiii. 15; *James*, ch. ii. 18 etc.; *Peter*, 1 Peter ii. 12 and *Paul*, Rom. ii. 6 etc.; viii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 10; Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 24. 25; Gal. vi. 7–9. The Scriptures uniformly teach that forgiving grace is not conditioned by any work; it is absolutely free and unmerited and presupposes nothing beyond a penitent mind and an appropriating of the righteousness of Christ; but it insists upon a

life corresponding with the will of God, and even supplies the needed strength to lead it. Faith must work by love, Gal. v. 6. It is the living root of all good works, while unbelief is the father of every sin. God looks upon the life of a man as one connected work. Hence we have here the singular ἔργον as at Matt. xvi. 27 πρᾶξις; for God looks at the one source of all our work, on our relation to the truth revealed in our conscience and in His word. But since all rational creatures ought to know the perfect justice of His decision, He judges them according to their works and here all mankind fall into only two classes. There is no inconsistency between this passage and John v. 22, where it is said that the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son [for, as Didymus says, the Father is the *fons judicii, judicante filio Pater est qui judicat.*—M.], just as the creation of the world is ascribed to the Father, although mediated by the Son, John i. 1 etc.; cf. 1 Peter iii. 12. 22; iv. 5; v. 4; 2 Peter ii. 9. [John v. 22 clearly implies that He who has delegated the judgment to the Son is *the Judge.*—M.]

In fear.—This does by no means militate, as Weiss maintains, against the Petrine and Johannean fundamental conceptions of the Christian life, as expressed Rom. viii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 7; 1 John iv. 18. These passages speak of a *slavish* fear which in believers makes room to filial love; filial fear and dread remains also in the children of God, while they continue in a state of imperfection; it flows from the contrast between themselves and God, from their dependence on Him and their remembrance of His holiness and justice, from the possibility of a relapse, cf. Phil. ii. 12, and mostly exhibits itself as a holy fear to grieve his love, to displease Him and to provoke His disfavour. Calvin: "Fear is here opposed to security," cf. Rom. xi. 20; 2 Cor. vii. 1; 2 Peter iii. 17; Ps. xxxiv. 10; xix. 10.—A reason of fear is also contained in the additional clause: "the time of your sojourning," while you tarry here below among strangers. You are not yet at home, but only on the way; like seafaring men you may possibly be cast on a strange coast. At all events you must fight your way through the world's hatred. John xv. 19.

[Wordsworth: Here is a connected series of arguments and motives to holiness, derived from a consideration,

1. Of the holy nature of Him whom we invoke as *Father*, whose *children* we are, whom therefore we are bound to imitate and to obey.

2. Of His office as *Judge*, rewarding every man according to his work, whom therefore we ought to fear.

3. Of Christ's office as *Redeemer*, and of His nature as an *all-holy* Redeemer, paying the costly price of His own blood to ransom us from a state of unholiness, and purchasing us to Himself, with His blood. Therefore we are not our own, but *His*; and being His, bought by His blood, we owe Him, who is the Holy One, the service of love and holiness. Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 19. 20; Eph. i. 7. 14; and *Clem. Rom.* i. 7. ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἴδωμεν ὡς ἐστι. τίμιον τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθέν. cf. 8. *Aug.* Serm. 36.

4. Of our *transitory* condition in this life. On the special allusion in παροικία, *sojourning* see ch. ii. 11.

5. Of the gift of the spirit of holiness.

6. Of our new birth by the living Word of God.—M.]

VER. 18. **Forasmuch as ye know.**—The consideration of the inestimable benefit of salvation supplies a new argument for aspiration to holiness of mind and conversation, v. v. 18. 19. Bede gives the right connection. "In proportion to the price at which you have been redeemed from the corruption of carnal life should be your fear not to grieve your Saviour's heart by a relapse, for the punishments will correspond to the worth of the ransom." This knowledge is the knowledge of faith, flowing from the fundamental consciousness of Christians, cf. ch. iii. 9; v. 9; James i. 3.

Redeemed.—λυτροῦν denotes not any release or deliverance, but to release by payment of a corresponding ransom. It corresponds to the Hebrew גָּאַל and פָּדָה, Ex. vi. 6; Ps. lxxiv. 2; lxxvii. 16; cvi. 10; Deut. vii. 8; ix. 26; Jer. xv. 21; xxxi. 11. So Christ says that He was giving His life as a ransom for many, Matt xx. 28: cf. Mark x. 45; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Titus ii. 14. The comparison of the blood of Christ with gold and silver proves that the word must be taken in its original sense. ἐξαγοράζειν is used in the same sense at Gal. iii. 13; 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; Rev. v. 9. The manner in which the redemption has been effected, is therefore the production and payment of an equivalent, viz.: the satisfaction, the substitution, cf. Eph. v. 2; i. 7; Rom. iii. 24; Heb. ix. 15.—Who received the ransom? Not the devil as maintained by some, but the Supreme Lawgiver and Judge. The justice of God, outraged by sin, was satisfied—the satisfaction itself, however, being appointed by the love of God Himself; allusions to which are even found in the sacrifices of the Old Testament, Lev. xvii. 11. Because this last passage states that the soul of the flesh is in the blood and that it is the blood which maketh atonement by the soul, cf. v. 14; blood is designated as the means of atonement both here and Rom. iii. 24. 25; v. 8. 9; while elsewhere the soul, the life of Christ is said to have been given. Blood has atoning virtue, for "without shedding of blood is no remission," Heb. ix. 22. Redemption relates therefore primarily to the curse and guilt of sin and secondarily to its enslaving power. The two ideas are not very sharply separated in Holy Writ, cf. ch. ii. 24; Is. liii. 7. It is most dear, most precious blood because it is undefiled by sin and passion and because it is the blood of the God-man and more valuable by far than the blood of many thousand valiant warriors. The addition v. 19, ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου, etc., confirms our explanation. ὡς indicates a well-known reason and refers to Is. liii. While in Isaiah the figure of the Lamb denotes immediately only the patient, silent suffering of the Messiah in His atoning death, the predicates used by the Apostle, clearly relate to sacrificial lambs, and particularly to the Paschal Lamb, cf. John i. 29. 36. Every sacrificial lamb had to be without blemish, Lev. iv. 32; iii. 6; xxii. 20 etc.;

i. 10; xii. 6; xiv. 10; Numb. xxviii. 3. 11; Ex. xii. 5. Christ as the Spiritual Sacrificial Lamb (1 Cor. v. 7; John xix. 36) was perfectly pure within and unstained by sin without, as Bengel rightly explains. "*In se non habet labem, neque extrinsecus maculam contraxit.*" Cf. 1 John iii. 5; 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. vii. 26; Eph. v. 27. From what are the children of God redeemed?

From your vain conversation, inherited from your fathers. [So the German.—M.] This describes the being of this world as untrue, as having its root in appearances, and as devoid of all foundation, strength and vitality, cf. Rom. i. 21; Eph. iv. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 20; 2 Peter ii. 18; Rom. viii. 20. Its main stay and support lies in the force of habits, ideas, views, principles and maxims transmitted from father to child through successive generations. Men justify their ways, saying, 'Such was the practice of our fathers and our forefathers,' and continue in the bonds of error and sinful lusts. Calov. explains πατροπαραδότου of original sin and of imitating paternal examples. The deep-rootedness of this vain conversation notwithstanding, deliverance and redemption from it is found in the death and blood of Jesus Christ. The Apostle does not specify how the atonement of Christ effects redemption from the power of sin; we may doubtless supply this solution (cf. 1 Peter ii. 24) thus: having been redeemed from the curse of the law by the blood of Jesus, we are enabled to be cleansed from sin, to be united to God and to approach Him with joy and courage. The Holy Spirit's power is present to deliver us from the dominion of sin.—Χριστοῦ, an explanatory addition serving as a transition to what follows.

Ver. 20. The personality and work of Christ were neither the natural result of the world's development nor the suddenly formed decree of God in *time* [as distinguished from eternity, M.], as if after the lapse of four thousand years He had suddenly thought of contriving this way of salvation, but Christ was destined and ordained from before the foundation of the world to redeem us by His blood; hence the prophets did foretell His life and sufferings, His death and glorious exaltation, vv. 11. 12. The antithesis φανερωθέντος does not warrant the positive conclusion that the Apostle thinks of the real (opposed to ideal) preëxistence of Christ. The sense might be as follows: The Messiah having ideally existed in the Spirit of God, in the fulness of time became also really manifest. But reverting to v. 11, where mention is made of the Spirit of Christ in the prophets, and considering that correctly speaking the φανεροῦν, is the manifestation of a previously hidden existence, and that while believers are said to have been fore-ordained it is never affirmed that they were manifested, we feel inclined to agree with Lutz and Schumann that the real preëxistence of Christ is probably presupposed here; φανεροῦν, however, relates also to the continuing manifestation of Christ by the preaching of the Gospel.

Before the foundation of the World.—καταβολή, the act of καταβάλλεσθαι denotes laying something down, laying the foundation; applied to the foundations of the earth (Job xxxviii. 6; Prov. viii. 29)=founding, creation, cf. John xvii. 24; Eph. i. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. i. 2. 3; Col. i. 26. The remark of Oettinger that the creation of the world is called καταβολή because the Visible originated from the Invisible by a fall, is ingenious, but far-fetched and untenable. He maintains that the word signifies *casting off*. Ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων; Tischendorff and Lachmann read ἐσχάτου. Χρόνοι periods of time shorter than aeons. The καιροί are definite portions of those periods. They are called, Acts ii. 17; 2 Tim. iii. 1, the last days. They form, since they have a similar character, a unit, and are called on that account the last hour, 1 John ii. 18, or the last time, Jude 18. It would seem to signify therefore the period from the glorification of Christ to His first visible advent [*vulgo*, his second advent, M.] cf. v. 5; but ἐπί may also mean, "near at hand," a sense in which it may be shown to be used at least with local reference.—Ἐσχάτων to be taken as neuter on account of the succeeding Article.

For you who.—Believers are the end and aim in the manifestation of the Redeemer: you may therefore view it, as if Christ had come for you only, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 7. The design of His manifestation was to make you also believers. You owe it to Him that you are able to believe (δι αὐτοῦ). Weiss gives the following connection: The manifestation of Christ effected by means of the preaching of the Gospel (ch. i. 12) and culminating in His resurrection and exaltation to glory, begets believing trust in God, who did work this miracle of miracles. He that has done such great things is also able (humanly speaking) to accomplish the greatest and highest expectations we can cherish. Thus faith becomes hope in God, who has done this miracle. Hope appears here as a new feature superadded to faith, cf. Rom. v. 2; Eph. i. 18. [Your faith rests on Christ's *resurrection*—it was God who raised him; your hope on Christ's *glorification*; it is God who has given him that glory. Alford.—M.] Εἰς Θέον signifies resting in, entering into God. Petr. Lomb. *Credendo in Deum ire.*—ὥστε denotes sequence not purpose. The exhortation here reverts once more to v. 12, with this difference, that what there is urged, is here supposed to exist.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The disciple of Jesus must intimately combine with confident repose in the grace of atonement, the desire after the pattern of God to become holy and to walk in holiness before Him, v. 13–15.

2. The state of Christians is marked by the singular characteristic that they must *become* what they *are:* born into lively hope, they have to learn daily to hope anew. They stand in faith and love, v. 5. 8, yet must ever suffer themselves to be anew excited thereto, v. 13. They are dead with Christ, Col. iii. 3, yet must daily mortify anew their sinful members, Col. iii. 5, etc. The riddle is solved by distinguishing between what we are in the eternal view of God and what in empirical reality, or between what we are in the new principle of life and what in its gradual development. That which is implanted in the *idea* and in the germ must be followed by a voluntary and all-sided development. [This sentence may have a misty

air to some, but I found it difficult to give the sense of the original without a long circumlocution. Light is shed upon it by the consideration that *idea* is not used in the popular, but in the philosophical sense. It appears to come nearer to *ideal* than to *idea* proper.—M.] By the side of the new man there continues, until we die, the old man who must be crucified day by day.

3. All exhortation to holiness of mind and conversation will prove ineffectual and unsuccessful, unless the firm foundation of it lies in confidence in the grace of God that meets us half-way in Christ, v. 13. The hope to which that confidence gives rise, namely, the hope of the glorious possession of heaven, supplies the power of victory in view of the temptations and enjoyments of this earthly world.

4. The agreement of the Old and New Testaments is evident from the circumstance that holiness after the pattern of God is in both the chief requirement and end of our vocation. Compare the Sermon on the Mount. The only difference being that the idea of holiness in the New Testament is more profound and spiritual than in the Old.

5. Justification at the last judgment will depend on our works; our works, whether flowing from faith or unbelief, will determine our respective destiny, v. 17; cf. Rom. ii. 13. 6. 7; Matt. xxv. 34; Rev. xx. 12; 2 Cor. ix. 6.

6. The blood of Jesus Christ is not the same as His death. Elsewhere also it is specially emphasized as the means of redemption, the ransom, Rom. iii. 25; v. 9; 1 John v. 6; Heb. x. 29; ix. 22; xiii. 20; Acts xx. 28; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 20; 1 John i. 7; Rev. i. 5; v. 9; vii. 14; xii. 11. God's law for the government of the world having been broken by sin, the blood of the holy God-Man is needed as an atonement, v. 19.

7. The resurrection of Jesus Christ is the seal set to the atoning virtue of His blood and at the same time the pledge of the perfecting of those, who as members of His body are united to Him, the head.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The tightened girdle of faith is a main essential to the pilgrim passing through the world to heaven.—The loins serve the purposes of walking, warring and carrying; the powers of the soul corresponding to these purposes have need to be strengthened.—"The Christian in the heavenly race, Must firmly set and keep his face, Fixed on Jerusalem."—TERSTEEGEN. The blissful end of Christian hope, v. 13.—The grace offered by Christ is the solid foundation for the soul's anchor to rest upon.—True faith is not an idle dream nor hollow talk.—The features of the regenerate exhibit the impress of their heavenly Father's image.—Spiritual blindness both the consequence and cause of the dominion of sinful lusts. v. 14.—Fear of self-deception, relapse and new offences against God is the sure guardian of our hope.—How do we recognize the time of our visitation?—What glorious hopes flow from the glory which Christ has obtained from His Father? STARKE. Would you be God's *child*, you must imitate Him, Eph. v. 1.—v. 17. What a great alliance! a bought slave, preferred to the distinction of an adopted child, it is to be hoped, will not complain of having to render to his Redeemer a reasonable and joyful service, after his former experience of the rudder and the whip.—If you meet with some adversity, think yourself for a night in uncomfortable quarters, you will have better accommodation when you get home.—You are greatly in error, and abuse the Gospel, if you consider all manner of vain conversation to belong to Christian liberty. In the work of salvation, redemption as the cause of salvation cannot be dissociated from the condition annexed to it, which is the renunciation of every evil work—the two, redemption and renunciation should go hand-in-hand, Luke i. 74. 75.—We are bound to honour, love and obey our parents and ancestors, but not to follow them in the vanity of conversation and sinful habits, Eph. vi. 1. 2; Matt. x. 37. Beware to form too low an opinion of any man, and still more to injure his soul's welfare, for every one has been redeemed by the inestimable price of the blood of Jesus.—If the atoning blood of Jesus is to benefit us, we must also carry the innocence, gentleness and patience of the Lamb of God, Col. i. 22.—Who, after the Apostle's doctrine preaches another Gospel is not of God, but of the devil, and he is by no means to be heard, Gal i. 8.

LISCO:—Motives to zeal for holiness: (*a*) the grace offered to Christians; (*b*) the blessedness of their filial relation to God; (*c*) the redemption effected by Jesus Christ.—The real character of Christ's redeemed people: (*a*) they are full of faith in God and Jesus Christ; (*b*) earnestly struggling with sin they strive after holiness; (*c*) they walk in righteousness and obedience to the commandments of God; (*d*) they abound in zeal to do good and are rich in faithful love of the brethren.—How the preciousness and assurance of our hope founded on the resurrection of Christ should influence our whole behaviour. The value of the blood of Christ: (1) what makes it invaluable: (*a*) the holiness of Him who shed it; (*b*) the glory of the work accomplished by it; (2) what is the evidence of our appreciation of the value of it.

BESSER, in illustration of v. 19, supplies the following narrative: A wealthy and kind Englishman once bought in the slave-market a poor negro for twenty pieces of gold. His benefactor presented him moreover with a certain sum of money, that he might buy therewith a piece of land and furnish himself with a home. Am I really free? May I go whither I will? cried the negro in the joy of his heart; well, let me be your slave, Massa: you have redeemed me, and I owe all to you. This touched the gentleman to the quick: he took the negro into his service, and he never had a more faithful servant. But, said that Englishman, I ought to learn a lesson from my grateful servant, which until then, alas, had little engaged my attention, namely, what is meant by the words: "Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold—but with the precious blood of Christ."

[VER. 13. Grace is bearing down upon, coming to meet the Christian who with girded loins sets out on his pilgrimage. The prodigal son was met by his Father.—M.] Faith establishes the heart on Jesus Christ, and hope lifts it up, being

on that rock, over the head of all intervening dangers, crosses and temptations, and sees the glory and happiness that follow after them.—Gather up your affections, that they hang not down to hinder you in your race and so in your hopes of obtaining; and do not only gather them up, but tie them up, that they fall not down again, or if they do, be sure to gird them straiter than before.—We walk through a world where there is much mire of sinful pollutions and therefore cannot but defile them; and the crowd we are among will be ready to tread on them, yea our own feet may be entangled in them and so make us stumble and possibly fall.

LEIGHTON:—VER. 14. The soul of man unconverted is no other but a den of impure lusts, wherein dwell pride, uncleanness, avarice, malice, etc. Just as Babylon is described Rev. xviii. 2; or as Is. xiii. 21. Were a man's eyes opened he would as much abhor to remain with himself in that condition, "as to dwell in a house full of snakes and serpents," as St. Austin says. As the offices of certain persons are known by the garb or livery they wear, so transgressors: where we see the world's livery we see the world's servants; they fashion or habit themselves according to their lusts; and we may guess that they have a worldly mind by their conformity to worldly fashions.

CLARKE:—Obedience to God is as much the mark of right knowledge, as a sinful life is the sure sign of ignorance of God.

VER. 15. *Summa religionis est imitari quem colis* (In LEIGHTON).—CLARKE:—Heathenism scarcely produced a god whose example was not the most abominable; their greatest gods, especially, were paragons of impurity; none of their philosophers could propose the objects of their adoration, as objects of imitation.

LEIGHTON:—VER. 17. This fear is not cowardice, it doth not debase, but elevate the mind, for it drowns all lower fears, and begets true fortitude and courage to encounter all danger for the sake of a good conscience and the obeying of God. The righteous is as bold as a lion, Prov. xxviii. 1. He dares do any thing but offend God: and to dare to do that is the greatest folly, and weakness, and baseness in the world. From this fear have sprung all the generous resolutions and patient sufferings of the saints and martyrs of God; because they durst not sin against Him, therefore they durst be imprisoned, and impoverished and tortured, and die for Him. Thus the prophet sets carnal and godly fear as opposite, and the one as expelling the other, Is. viii. 12. 13. And our Saviour, Lk. xii. 4, "Fear not them which kill the body, but fear him which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you fear *Him*." Fear not, but fear, and therefore fear, that you may not fear.—He made all the persons and he makes all those differences Himself, as it pleaseth Him; therefore He doth not admire them as we do; no, nor at all regard them: we find very great odds betwixt stately palaces and poor cottages, betwixt a prince's robes and a beggar's cloak; but to God they are all one, all these petty grievances vanish in comparison of His own greatness; men are great and small compared one with another; but they all amount to just nothing in respect of Him; we find high mountains and low valleys on this earth, but compared with the vast compass of the heavens, it is all but as a point, and hath no sensible greatness at all.

[Our sojourn on earth is a state of probation, from which the fear of God is inseparable.—M.]

[VER. 18. The doctors of the synagogue had delivered traditions to the Jews which made the worship of God vain, Matt. xv. 9; and the Gentiles sought to justify their vain idolatry on the plea of tradition, saying (on the authority of Plato, *Tim.* p. 1053 E. and Cicero, de *Nat. Deor.* 3, n. 3. 6.) That they "were not to be moved, by any persuasions, from the religion which they had received from their forefathers."—M.]

[VER. 19. "All glory be to Thee, almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that Thou, of Thy tender mercy, didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world." Book of Common Prayer, *Communion Office.*—M.]

[VER. 20. The Jews say, that "When God created the world, He held forth His hand under the throne of glory, and created the soul of the Messiah and His company, and said to Him, Wilt thou heal and redeem my sons, after six thousand years? He answered, Yes. God said to Him, If so, wilt thou bear chastisements, to expiate their iniquity, according to what is written, (Is. liii. 4) 'Surely, He bore our griefs?' He answered, I will endure them with joy." And to this representation of this covenant made with the Messiah "before the creation of the world" it may be the Apostle here refers. In the style of Philo, he is ἀΐδιος Λόγος, "the Eternal Word, the first born and the most ancient Son of the Father, by whom all the species were framed." This therefore is according to the received opinion of the Jews. Whitby citing Cartw. Mellif. I. p. 2974, 75, and De Plaut. Noe, p. 169, D.—M.]

LEIGHTON:—VER. 21. When you look through a red glass, the whole heavens seem bloody; but through pure unclouded glass, you receive the clear light, that is so refreshing and comfortable to behold. When sin unpardoned is betwixt, and we look on God through that, we can perceive nothing but anger and enmity, in His countenance; but make Christ once the *medium*, our pure Redeemer, and through Him, as clear transparent glass, the beams of God's favourable countenance shine in upon the soul; the Father cannot look upon his well beloved Son, but graciously and pleasingly.

[Redemption flows from the precious blood of Christ, faith and hope from His glorious resurrection.—M.]

CHAPTER I. 22–25.

Analysis:—Exhortation to pure and fervent brotherly love, as characteristic of those who have been born to love by the life-seed of the eternal word.

22 Seeing ye have purified[1] your souls in obeying[2] the truth through the Spirit[3] unto un-
feigned love of the brethren, *see that ye* love one another with[4] a pure heart fervently:[5]
23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God,
24 which liveth and abideth for ever.[6] For all flesh[7] *is* as grass, and all the glory of
man[8] as the flower of grass.[9] The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth
25 away: But the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by
the gospel is preached unto you.

Verse 22. [[1] ἡγνικότες, having purified; *castificantes*, Vulg., making chaste, Wiclif.—M.]
[[2] ὑπακοῇ—in obedience of, Germ.—M.]
[[3] διὰ πνεύματος omitted in A B C. Cod. Sin., inserted in Rec. K. L.—M.]
[διὰ—by, nor through, see v. 33.—M.]
[[4] ἐκ καθαρᾶς. ἐκ, out of, from, Germ.; omitted in A B, inserted in Rec. C. K. L.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. **καρδ. ἀληθινῆς.—M.]
[[5] ἐκτενῶς—*intente*.—M.]

Verse 23. [[6] ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος—by the word of God living and enduring.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. omits εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.—M.]

Verse 24. [[7] διότι—because.—M.]
[[8] ἀνθρώπου in Rec. for αὐτῆς. If the latter reading is preferred, we must render "and all the glory of it," *i. e.* of flesh. So Wiclif and Reims.—M.]
[[9] ἐξηράνθη, ἐξέπεσεν, aorists, statement as in a narrative; viz.: the grass hath withered and the flower thereof is fallen away; Wiclif and Reims: *Exaruit fœnum et flos ejus decidit.* Vulgate. German.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. ὡσει (**improb.).—ἡ δόξ. αὐτοῦ.—**δόξ. αὐτῆς. ἀνθ.—Without αὐτοῦ.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 22. Connection. The exhortation (v. 13) "Hope perfectly for the grace," fully corresponds to the second leading exhortation, "Love one another fervently." The former was founded (in a participial sentence) on the concentration of thoughts and constant sobriety; the latter is founded (also in a participial sentence) on purifying the soul in obedience of the truth. Brotherly love must be the exponent of the nature, strength and fruit of regeneration.

Purified.—Ἁγνίζειν denotes the laying aside of evil, the putting off lust, hatred, envy and hypocrisy; ἁγιάζειν, on the other hand, the positive putting on the opposite good and growing therein, cf. ch. ii. 1. The Perfect shows that the purifying does not belong exclusively to the past but is affected by the imperative form ἀγαπᾶτε. [The German reads so (instead of ἀγαπήσατε) on the authority of the Codex Colbertinus Cent. XI.—M.], and indicates that such pure love cannot exist without the antecedent purifying of the soul. The Apostle means a constantly needed purifying, not one merely begun in regeneration. Augustine: "Chastity of the soul consists in sincerity of faith and purifying the heart from unchaste flames."

In obedience of the truth.—By absolute subjection to the truth given in the word of God, by keeping it and causing it to work in the heart. Obedience to the faith and moral obedience are again comprised in one. Truth has a purifying and separating power, removing all obstacles to the exercise of brotherly love, such as selfishness, obstinacy, self-sufficiency, men-pleasing, ambition, flattery, in fact, all manifestations of egotism. Because true believers are the children of God, ch. i. 8. 14. 17, they should act as brethren one to another. This is one of the principal commandments of Christ Himself, and consequently one of the main ends of holiness, Matt. xxii. 40; Mk. xii. 31; Luke x. 28; Jno. xiii. 34. 35; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 17; v. 9. But because selfishness, deceit, hypocrisy and flattery are frequently hidden under the cloak of love, the word ἀνυπόκριτος is added.

By the spirit, is wanting in several MSS. If, as is probable, authentic, it should be joined to ἡγνικότες not to ὑπακοῇ. It denotes the Holy Spirit, by whom alone the soul can be purified, Acts xv. 8. 9; Rom. viii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 3; Eph. v. 9. πνεύματος is also without the article in ch. i. 2.

Unfeigned love of the brethren.—Brotherly love being thus rendered possible, its free and actual exhibition ought to follow. There being two kinds of love, pure and impure, heavenly and earthly, the Apostle expressly adds, "out of a pure heart." Lachman strikes καθαρᾶς out of the text. Purity of heart is equally demanded in other passages, Matt. v. 8; 1 Tim. i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 22. Bengel nicely remarks that purifying qualities, as antecedents to brotherly love, are also insisted upon at 2 Peter i. 5. 6.

ἐκτενῶς is a very pregnant addition. It denotes stretching out, straining, putting forth strenuous effort, hence (*a*) by straining and extending every energy, by untiring elasticity, (*b*) by sustained perseverance, (*c*) by extending it to such brethren as appear less worthy of love. Weiss: "With lasting, persevering energy, that cannot be tired out by the cumulating guilt of our neighbour," ch. iv. 8. The possibility of such a mode of conduct belongs to the state of regeneration, v. 23; cf. Matt. xviii. 21. 22; see above on v. 3. Steiger. "As natural relationship produces natural affec-

tion, so spiritual relationship produces spiritual affection." It is lasting, because emanating from an eternal source of life.

VER. 23. **Of (out of) incorruptible sowing.** σπορά denotes begetting, sowing, not seed, as many translate, cf. John i. 13. Regeneration is not the effect of a transient act of begetting, but of the power of the Holy Ghost. The means He uses is the word of God, Jas. i. 18; 1 Cor. iv. 15. Paul laying claim in the latter passage to the new birth or new-begetting of the Corinthians means nothing beyond his having been an instrument of the Holy Ghost. [The full idea is brought out by noticing the force of the prepositions ἐξ and διά. The Apostle says, "Being born again, not of"—ἐξ, that is, out of—"corruptible seed" (like *semen humanum*), but out of "incorruptible begetting"—διά—"by means of the word of God." 'The ἐξ of origination rests in God himself, the Father, who begat us, of His own will: the διά of instrumentality moves on and abides forever.' Alford.—M.]

By means of the word of God living and abiding forever.—Ζῶντος καὶ μένοντος belong to λόγου, as is evident from the sequel, v. 25. The Apostle does not speak of the Being of God, but of the nature of the word of God. It is living, cf. Heb. iv. 12, because it has life in itself, is indued with eternal, with divine power and therefore begets life in its turn, cf. Acts vii. 38. Luther: "If I put the cup, containing the wine, to my lips, I drink the wine without swallowing the cup. Such also is the word, which brings the voice; it sinks into the heart and becomes alive, while the voice remains without and passes away. It is therefore a Divine power, yea, it is God himself, cf. Ex. iv. 11." It is able to kill, Rom. vii. 10, and to make alive.—Μένοντος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. (The last three words are wanting in important MSS. and therefore omitted by Griesbach and others). It remains forever in its nature, power and effects. [Dean Jackson *on the Creed*, book 7, ch. 28, vol. 7, p. 270: "If *Christ's flesh and blood* be the *seed* of Immortality, how are we said to be born again *by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever?* Is this Word, by which we are born, the same with that immortal seed, of which we are born? It is the same, not in nature, but in person. May we not, in that speech of St. Peter, by the Word, understand the word preached unto us by the Ministers who are God's seedsmen? In a *secondary* sense we may, for we are begotten and born again by preaching, as by the instrument or means. Yet born again we are by the *Eternal Word* (that is, by *Christ* Himself), as by the proper and efficient cause of our new birth. . . And Christ Himself, who was put to death for our sins, and raised again for our justification, is *the Word* which we all do or ought to preach. The Son of God manifested in the flesh, was that *Word* which, in St. Peter's language, is *preached by the Gospel*, and if we do not preach *this Word* unto our hearers, if all our sermons do not tend to one of these two ends, either to instruct our auditors in the articles of their creed concerning Christ, or to prepare their ears and hearts that they may be fit auditors of such instructions, we do not preach the Gospel unto them, we take upon us the name of God's ambassadors, or of the ministers of the Gospel, in vain."—M.]

[A Lapide: "This sense is a genuine and sublime one, because in our Regeneration, Christ Himself is personally communicated to us, so that the Deity thenceforth dwells in us as in a Temple, and we are made partakers of the Divine Nature, 2 Pet. i. 4." See James i. 18–21.—M.]

VER. 24. διότι introduces the proof of the difference between corruptible begetting and incorruptible. The begetting is like the instrument of begetting. The words quoted by Peter are found Is. xl. 7, etc.; his citation is free, not literal. Flesh signifies here the whole living world, inasmuch as it is under the power of transitoriness and surrounded by weakness. Bengel: "The old man, man of the old birth, especially self-righteousness, on which man is wont to found his confidence." Calvin: "Whatever is highly esteemed in things human, beauty, bodily strength, learning, riches, posts of honour." It includes also the life of the natural mind, as long as it remains unoccupied and without the animation of the Spirit of God. Hence the Scripture speaks of fleshly-mindedness, Rom.. viii. 5–7, and reckons also hatred, anger and pride among the works of the flesh, 1 Cor. iii. 3; Gal. v. 19; Eph. ii. 3; Col. ii. 18. The flesh as well as the spirit, has its glory and flower. It appears robed in the forms of beauty, wisdom, nobleness, patriotism and even of holiness. It develops itself in forms of government, in art and science, in philosophical systems and theories of religion, so far as they are not penetrated by the Spirit of God. Hence they vanish as fast as they grow, yea faster—like the flower of grass (Griesbach and others read αὐτῆς after δόξα. See Appar. Crit. above), whose leaves fall asunder, cf. Ps. ciii. 15; xxxvii. 2; James i. 10; Is. xl. 6. 7. Peter refers to the last passage as given by the LXX., where the past tense is used, which describes with graphic effect the rapidity of the change.

VER. 25. **But the word of the Lord endureth forever,** ever green and in vigour of life; it is continually valid and efficient, enduring to eternity, and so is whatever emanates from or originates in it, cf. Ps. cxix. 89; Luke xxi. 33. Luther: "You need not open your eyes wide how you may get to the word of God; it is before your eyes, it is the word which we preach." Deut. xxx. 11; Rom. x. 6, etc. The word of the Gospel preached to Christians is essentially one with the kernel of the word of the Old Testament, cf. Rom. xvi. 26; Eph. ii. 20; iii. 5.—Εἰς ὑμᾶς, it has been brought unto you and implanted in you. The circumstance of Peter taking for granted that his readers are familiar with the word of the Old Testament, furnishes a hint that he writes to Jewish Christians. [Wordsworth: The transition from the Incarnate Word to the spoken and written word, and *vice versâ*, is, as might be anticipated, of not unfrequent occurrence in Holy Writ: see Heb. iv. 12; James i. 18–23.—Observe, also, that St. Peter here *returns* to the principal person, Christ, and speaks of Him, who is the *Living Word*, as being also the *Living Stone*, ii 4.—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1 The necessity of purifying the soul was recognized even in the systems of the philosophers, *e. g.*, in the *Platonic* and *Neoplatonic* schools; but the only means of accomplishing it was unknown to them: subjection to revealed truth, appropriating and practising it.

2. Purification must begin and without interruption continue in the soul, the stronghold and seat of sin.

3. Essential unity of the message of salvation in the Old and New Testaments, v. 25.

4. Regeneration or new-birth, the first implanting into the new, spiritual life, must be distinguished from quickening and conversion. The Scripture clearly teaches that regeneration takes place through Baptism by means of the word and through the Spirit who animates it, John iii. 5; Tit. iii. 5; Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 26. 27; Eph. v. 25-27; 1 Peter iii. 21. Compare the lucid exposition of Kurz in *Christ. Religion* (Christliche Religionslehre) p. 196. 197, 5th ed.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Incorruptible sowing or generation yields incorruptible fruit, a new man. As is the origin of life, so are the effects that flow from it.—While the non-christian loves in Adam, the believer loves in Christ. The former passes off carnal inclination for true love.—Regeneration is not the completion but the beginning of Christianity. The word of God, which is intrinsically spirit and life must also become alive in us. It is a fire, but it cannot prove its power, as long as it touches us only superficially.

Starke:—Hearty brotherly love comprises also brotherly correction, which should take place in a loving and gentle spirit, Gal. vi. 1.—The analogy between the word of God and seed in the field exhibits the following particulars: 1. The seed has in itself the power of growth, and does not receive it from the field. The word of God has power within itself and manifests itself as a spiritual growth. 2. The seed requires a well-prepared field; the word of God a soul ready to be qualified for receiving it and bearing fruit. 3. The seed needs a sower to scatter it in due season and in the right manner; the word of God needs the office of teachers, or spiritual husbandmen. 4. The scattered seed must be harrowed in, in order to be thoroughly mixed up with the soil and in order to grow above to strike root below; so the word of God, which is therefore called the implanted word, James i. 21. 5. The seed bears no fruit unless it be quickened by warm sunshine and fertile showers from above: so also the word of God, which although it has living power in itself, requires the supply of grace by the Holy Ghost. 6. The seed of one kind, scattered on differing soil, good, bad and indifferent, owing to the inequality of the soil, does not yield the same fruit: so it is with the word of God.—Christianity insists not so much on a mere externally blameless conversation as on regeneration, Gal. vi. 15; Phil. ii. 5.—We know no other word of God than that which was preached by Christ and the Apostles throughout the whole world, is put on imperishable record and still continues before our eyes.

Lisco:—Of what passes away and of what remains.

[Ver. 22. The properties of brotherly love. 1. It is *unfeigned*, more of the heart and the hand than of the lip. 2. It is *pure*, beginning and ending in God. 3. It is *fervent* with all the energies of the soul on the stretch. The sympathy of the whole body with any injured or diseased member a Scriptural illustration.—M.]

[Leighton:—The true reason why there is so little truth of this Christian mutual love amongst those that are called Christians, is, because there is so little of this purifying obedience to the truth, whence it flows; faith unfeigned would beget this love unfeigned: men may exhort to them both, but they require the hand of God to work them in the heart.

Ver. 24. The philosopher said of his countrymen . . . "that they eat as if they meant to die to-morrow and yet build as if they were never to die."—Archimedes was killed in the midst of his demonstration. Cf. Ps. cxlvi. 4.—We in our thoughts shut up death into a very narrow compass, namely, in the moment of our expiring; but the truth is, as the moralist observes, it goes through all our life; for we are still losing and spending it as we enjoy it, yea, our very enjoying it, is the spending it; yesterday's life is dead today and so shall this day's life be to-morrow.—M.]

[What is the great defect in all human greatness and beauty—in earth-born riches and pleasures? —Transitoriness.—M.]

[Macknight:—Ver. 25. This is a quotation from Is. xl. 6-8, where the preaching of the gospel is foretold and recommended from the consideration that every thing which is merely human, and among the rest, the noblest races of mankind, with all their glory and grandeur, their honour, riches, beauty, strength and eloquence; as also the arts which men have invented and the works they have executed, shall decay as the flowers of the field. But the gospel, called by the prophet *the word of the Lord*, shall be preached while the world standeth.—M.]

[Leighton:—As the word of God itself cannot be abolished, but surpasses the endurance of heaven and earth, as our Saviour teaches, and all attempts of men against the Divine truth of that word to undo it, are as vain as if they should consent to pluck the sun out of the firmament, so likewise is the heart of a Christian, it is immortal and incorruptible.—M.]

CHAPTER II. 1–10.

Analysis:—Exhortation of the regenerate to nourish themselves with the word of God, and to grow in Christ, to build themselves up on Him and to approve themselves a spiritual priesthood.

1 Wherefore laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and
2 all evil speakings[1], As newborn babes, desire[2] the sincere milk of the word[3], that ye
3,4 grow thereby; If so be[4] ye have tasted that the Lord *is* gracious[5]. To whom coming[6],
as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God[7], *and* precious,
5 [8]Ye also, as [9]lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up
6 spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by[10] Jesus Christ. [11]Wherefore also it is con-
tained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious:
7 and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded.[12] [13]Unto you therefore which be-
lieve *he is* precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders
9 disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, And a stone of stumbling, and
rock of offence, *even to them* which stumble at the word, being disobedient[14]: where-
9 unto also they were appointed. But ye *are* a chosen generation, a royal priesthood,
a holy nation, a peculiar people[15]; that ye should shew forth[16] the praises[17] of him who
10 hath called you out of darkness into[18] his marvellous[19] light: Which in time past *were*
not a people[20], but *are* now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy[21], but
now have obtained mercy[22].

Verse 1. [[1] καταλαλίας—slanderings, so German; backbiting; Wiclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva; detractions, Reims.—M.]
[[2] ἐπιποθήσατε—long, yearn for, so German; covet, Wiclif.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. *πᾶσαν καταλαλίαν.—M.]
Verse 2. [[3] λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα—spiritual (Alford) guileless milk. Many important MSS. add after αὐξηθῆτε, εἰς σωτηρίαν.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. αὐξη.θ. εἰς σωτηρίαν.—M.]
Verse 3. [[4] εἴπερ—if, otherwise, German; if, that is, Alford.—M.]
[[5] χρηστὸς—good, Geneva; sweet, Wiclif, Reims, Vulgate; pleasant, Tyndale.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. *ει—M.]
Verse 4. [[6] προσερχόμενοι—nighing, Wiclif; approaching, Reims, Germ.—M.]
[[7] παρὰ Θεῷ—with God, *i. e.*, before God.—M.]
Verse 5. [[8] οἰκοδομεῖσθε, Imper.—be ye built up.—M.]
[[9] λίθοι ζῶντες—living stones.—M.]
[[10] διὰ—through, Germ.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. ἐποικοδ.—πνεύματος (**πνευματικ.)—ισ—Θεῷ without Article.—M.]
Verse 6. [[11] διότι—for the which cause, Reims; because, Alford.—M.]
[[12] καταισχυνθῇ—ashamed, Germ., Tyndale, Geneva.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. ἐν γρ.—*ἐπ' αὐτόν.—M.]
Verse 7. [[13] To you, then, who believe, is the honour,—so, substantially, Wiclif, Reims, Vulgate, Germ., Alford. See note below.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. *ἡμῖν—ἀπιστοῦσιν—**λιθοσ.—M.]
Verse 8. [[14] And a stone of stumbling and rock of offence,—at which they stumble, Germ.—who stumble, Alford—being disobedient to the word, de Wette, Alford; who believe not on the word, Germ. At any rate ἀπειθοῦντες not προςκόπτουσι belongs to τῷ λόγῳ.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. **οἱ καὶ προσκόπτ.—M.]
Verse 9. [[15] λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν—a people for acquisition; of purchasing, Wiclif; of purchase, Reims; *acquisitionis*, Vulgate.—M.]
[[16] ἐξαγγείλητε—publish, literally, tell out; Alford.—M.]
[[17] τὰς ἀρετὰς—the virtues, Luther, Vulgate; the perfection, Kistemaker.—M.]
[[18] εἰς—to, unto, rather than into, German.—M.]
[[19] θαυμαστὸν—wonderful, German.—M.]
Verse 10. [[20] No people, German.—M.]
[[21], [22] Uncompassionated—compassionated, Alford.—οὐκ marks contrariety, unpitied and pitied.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Wherefore, laying aside.**—The section v. 1.—v. 10. is connected, as are the exhortations in ch. i. 22, with the idea of regeneration and the love out of a pure heart flowing from it. To brotherly love out of a pure heart are opposed guile, deception, hypocrisy, envy and slander; if that is to spring up, these vices must die. On this account Peter exhorts Christians to lay them aside, to put them off. If a new life is implanted, it must grow, and therefore have corresponding, wholesome nourishment; on this account Peter entreats them to long for that nourishment that thus they might be able to grow and to overcome temptations.—The construction is here as in ch. i. 22. The Imperative reacts on the Participle. Laying aside is a figure taken from clothing and of frequent occurrence, Col. iii. 8; Eph. iv. 22; Jas. i. 21. The old man is a garment, wholly surrounding, closely-fitting and forming a whole with us. "Take away the filthy garments from him—set a fair mitre upon his head," was the direction concerning Joshua the high priest, Zech. iii. 8. The angel adding, "Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of

raiment." The figures of laying aside and putting on clothes was peculiarly apposite because the early Christians were wont to lay aside their old garments and to exchange them for white and clean apparel when they were baptized and regenerated. It is necessary to observe that the exhortation to laying aside is only addressed to those who had the new man, while the unbelieving and unregenerate had first to receive another mind [*μετάνοια*, after-thought, after-wisdom, a change of disposition must precede baptism and new-birth.—M.]. The vices to be laid aside bear upon the relation to our neighbour and exert a deadly influence on brotherly love. *κακία* [*nocendi cupiditas*] denotes here, in particular, malicious disposition toward others, aiming at their hurt, injury and pain, and assuming various manifestations, cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 5. The accomplishment of such evil intent necessitates lying, cunning and other artifices; its concealment requires hypocrisy and dissembling. The sense of dependence on those before whom dissimulation is practised, the sight of their happiness, the shame felt in the conscience in the presence of the virtuous—excite envy, and envy engenders all manner of evil, detracting and injurious speaking. [*Malitia malo delectatur alieno; invidia bono cruciatur alieno; dolus duplicat cor; adulatio duplicat linguam; detractatio vulnerat famam.*—Augustine.—M.]. 'Thus,' observed Flacius, 'one vice ever genders another.' Huss says of *καταλαλιά* that it takes place in various ways, either by denying or darkening a neighbour's virtues, and either by attributing to him evil or imputing to him evil designs in doing good.

Ver. 2. **As newborn babes.**—This goes back to ch. i. 23. The connection is similar to ch. i. 14. They had been addressed as children of obedience, now their young and tender state is mentioned as a reason why they should seek strength in the word of God. 'Newborn babes' was a current expression among the Jews for proselytes and neophytes. As the desire and need of nourishment predominate in the former, so they ought to predominate in babes in Christ. The expression so far from being derogatory, sets forth the tenderness of their relation to God, and implies the idea of guilelessness, cf. Is. xl. 11; Lk. xviii. 15, etc.

Long for—word.—*ἐπιποθεῖν* denotes intense and ever recurring desire. While the regenerate experience a longing after the word of God, by which they had been begotten, similar to the desire of newborn babes for their mother's milk, Ps. cxix. 81. 72; xix. 11, still the hereditary sin which yet cleaves to them renders it necessary that they should be constantly urged to the diligent use of the divine word in order to partake of it.—Milk, in opposition to solid food, 1 Cor. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; vi. 1, signifies the rudiments of Christian doctrine, not only its simple representation adapted to the capacity of the weak but also the more easily intelligible articles of Christianity. In this place, however, where no such antithesis exists, the figure comprises the sum-total of Christianity, the whole Gospel. Milk is the first, most simple, most refreshing, most wholesome food, especially for children; so is the word of God, cf. Is. lv. 1. The most advanced Christians ought to consider themselves children, in respect of what they are to be hereafter. "Christ, the crucified, is milk for babes, food for the advanced." Augustine. Clement of Alexandria suggests the partaking of the incarnate *Logos*.—*λογικόν* is best explained by the Apostle's peculiarity to elucidate his figures by additional illustrations, cf. ch. i. 13. 23. It is milk contained in and flowing from the word, spiritual milk, which, as Luther explains, is drawn with the soul. The rendering '*reasonable*' is against the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, and equally inadmissible in Rom. xii. 1. [Alford renders 'spiritual' after Allioli and Kistemaker.—M.] The nature of this milk is further defined by *ἄδολον*, which means unadulterated, pure, cf. 2 Cor. iv. 2; ii. 17. [*ἄδολον* seems rather to be in contrast with *δόλον* in v. 1.—M.] It is consequently doctrine that is not compounded with human wisdom and thus rendered inefficacious. For the word of God has the property that it exerts purifying, liberating, illuminating and consoling influences only in its purity and entireness. Irenæus says of the heretics: "They mix gypsum with the milk, they taint the heavenly doctrine with the poison of their errors."

ἐν αὐτῷ, receiving it into your innermost soul, making it your full property. Growth in holiness depends on the constant assimilation of the word. "The mother who gave them birth, nourishes them also."—Harless.

Ver. 3. **If, otherwise ye have tasted.**—A conditional statement is often by emphasis accepted as real. Grotius renders the sense well; "I know that you will this, as surely as you—cf. Rom. viii. 9; 2 Thes. i. 6." This form of speech contains also an invitation to self-examination. Calov perceives a connection with ver. 1. "The more you eradicate the bitter root of malice, the more also do you taste the sweetness of the goodness of the Lord." Cf. Song of Sol. ii. 3; v. 13; *Sir.* xxiii. 27. The expression, to taste with reference to the figure of milk, and with full allusion to Ps. xxxiv. 9, denotes experience of the essential virtue of a thing as perceived by the sense of taste. It is transferred very properly to the experiences of the soul which enters into and unites with the object in order to know it in all its bearings. Cf. Heb. vi. 5; ii. 9. [Alford says, "The infant once put to the breast desires it again."—M.]

[Wordsworth quotes the words of Augustine (*Serm.* 353), addressed to the newly *baptized:* "These words are specially applicable to you, who are yet fresh in the infancy of spiritual regeneration. For to you mainly the Divine Oracles speak, by the Apostle St. Peter, Having laid aside all malice, and all guile, as newborn infants desire ye the "*rationabile et innocens lac, ut in illo crescatis ad salutem,*" if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious (*dulcis.*) And we are witnesses that ye have tasted it . . . . Cherish, therefore, this spiritual infancy. The infancy of the strong is humility. The manhood of the weak is pride."—M.]

That the deed is good.—[Friendly, Germ.] *χρηστός* applied to tender, pleasant-tasting solids and liquids, to the sweet flavour of old wine, Luke v. 39; then to persons, kindly, friendly, condescending, Eph. iv. 32; Luke vi. 35. *Ὁ κύριος* is the Lord Jesus, ver. 4, who invites us to Him-

self and commends to us the ease of His yoke, Matt. xi. 29. He is here represented as the spiritual means of nourishment, the partaking whereof promotes the new life of Christians, and draws them to the word, which is His revelation, and in a certain sense identical with Him. "This is tasting indeed," says Luther, "to believe from the heart that Christ has given Himself to me and has become my own, that my misery is His, and His life mine. Feeling this from the heart, is tasting Christ." [**The Lord,** "*quod subjicitur; ad quem accedentes, non simpliciter ad Deum refertur, sed ipsum designat qualis patefactus est in persona Christi.*"—Calvin.]

VER. 4. **To whom approaching.**—The Imperative construction is best adapted to what follows, as it supplies an appropriate progress in the development of the thought. We had before: "Take nourishment from the word of God, and from the communion of Christ; this is followed by an exhortation contemplating the gathering of a congregation of God, to wit: Build up yourselves, as living stones, into a temple of God. Ever-renewed approaching Christ is the means and condition of building. The Apostle thinks of passages like the following, Ps. cxviii. 22, 23; Is. viii. 14; xxviii. 16; Luke ii. 34; Matt. xxi. 42; cf. Matt. xi. 29; Jno. vi. 37. In the Old Testament, the priests are those who approach and draw near to God, Lev. xvi. 1; Ezek. xl. 46; Numb. ix. 13; in the New Testament access to God is opened to all through Christ, cf. Heb. ix. 1, etc.; vii. 25; x. 22; xi. 6; iv. 16. We draw near to Christ by prayer—(considering His person, His merit and His office)—by entering into His Word and drawing therefrom grace for grace by faith.

Unto a living stone.—The Apostle being about to speak of the sacred edifice of the New Testament, felt of course anxious to designate Christ as the corner-stone thereof. By the glory of the corner-stone, he desires to impress us with the glory of the edifice to be reared thereon. (Weiss). We do not decide upon the suggestion of Gerhard that Peter alludes to his own name. [*Petrus a petra Christo sic denominatus metaphora, petræ delectatur, ac suo exemplo docet omnes debere esse petros, h. e., vivos lapides supra Christum fide ædificatos.* Gerhard.—M.] Cf. Acts iv. 11; Rom. xi. 11; Eph. ii. 20; 1 Cor. x. 4; Zech. iii. 9. He is a stone or a rock, because after the manner of rocks, He remains ever the same, unchangeably powerful and invincible; because His word is firm and immovable, and because God has ordained and designed Him to be the foundation of His spiritual temple. But why a living stone? This predicate reminds us of the predicates Peter is wont to join to other images, vv. 2. 5; i. 13; it denotes not only a spiritual stone, but alludes to the circumstance that His rocky firmness is to His followers not hardness, but absolute reliability, truth and faithfulness, that in Him there is nothing of rigidity and death but absolute light and life. Calov.—"He is alive and makes alive." Jno. v. 28; vi. 48; xiv. 19, etc.; iv. 10; Acts ii. 28. He penetrates and fills with His life the whole organism of believers, and causes it to grow. "Peter here tenders us the most urgent invitation to draw near to Christ, for those to whom Christ is as yet a mummy, cannot feel themselves drawn to Him." Steiger.

Disallowed indeed of men, but - - precious.—*ἀποδοκιμάζειν*—to reject on proof or trial, like useless coin, to reject for want of proper qualification. *Heb.* מָאַס . He was rejected not only by the builders, but by men of every kind, of every occupation, of every age and generation, by Jews and Gentiles. Hence the expression is quite general, rejected of men, of the whole world of unbelievers. Opposed to this human judgment, proceeding from enmity to whatever is Divine and depending solely on externals, is the alone decisive judgment of God. Before God, in His eyes, and according to His decree He is chosen out and acknowledged precious and excellent before many millions, (antithesis between *ἐκλεκτόν* and *ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον*) and had in great honour. Cf. 1 Tim. v. 21; Luke ix. 35; Rom. xvi. 13. Everything met in Him the exact fulfilment of what prophecy had foretold concerning Him, and God made even His resurrection the means of establishing His Messianic character. Peter alludes to Is. xxviii. 16, and laying stress on His preciousness with God, omits several of the predicates used in that passage. His rejection, therefore, so far from being matter of reproach, is one of the chief signs by which Jesus may be known as the true Messiah.

VER. 5. **Be ye also built up**, etc. *οἰκοδομεῖσθε* cf. Jude 20, to be taken as a Middle in a reflexive sense. Christ being so excellent a corner-stone, on which rests the entire spiritual temple of God, be ye also inserted therein. Such being built up is something very different from a few ephemeral or passing flights of emotion; it starts from a solid foundation, includes continued and systematic activity, and demands in particular that every one, even he who is firmly and closely inserted in Jesus, should suffer himself to be put in that place and there to be inserted as a member of the whole, which the will of the great Architect assigns to him. **As living stones,** forasmuch as you are living stones and in the regeneration, ch. i. 3; ii. 2; have put on spiritual life emanating from Christ, cf. Jno. v. 26; xi. 25; x. 28; xiv. 19. Calov specifies the following points of comparison: (*a*) the building upon the foundation-stone. "The stones of the building cannot stand without the foundation-stone. We do not carry Him, but He carries us. If we stand and rely upon Him, we must also abide where He is." Luther. (*b*) The hardness and firmness in order to resist all assaults of enemies and all storms. Bernard, *Serm.* 60, *on the Song of Sol.*, says: "Raised on the Rock, I stand secure from the enemy and all calamities; the world shakes, the body oppresses me, the devil pursues me; but I do not fall, for I am founded on a firm rock." (*c*) The working, grinding, polishing and fitting of the stones. (*d*) The joining together with particular reference to the tie of love. (*e*) The mutual supporting. The lower stone supports the upper, this again the lower and the side stone, as Gregory says in *Hom. on Ezek.*: "In the Holy Church each supports the other, and each is supported by the other." Cf. the vision of the building of the Church triumphant in *Hermæ Pastor*, vis. 3.

A spiritual house, not apposition, but effect and end of the building. Grotius rightly observes: In the spiritual building, individual believers are both living stones with reference to the whole temple of the Church, and a spiritual house or a temple of God, but this is inapplicable to this passage, which evidently treats of the founding of a people of God, (v. 9). As a house is a whole, consisting of different parts, so is the Church of God; as one master rules in a house, so the Triune Jehovah rules in His temple; cf. Eph. ii. 22; 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16. Among believers each is not to aim at separating himself into a house by himself; they should be united in the commonwealth of God, and together should constitute a spiritual temple. It is called spiritual in opposition to the material temple, made with hands, and also because it is wrought and occupied by the Spirit.

For a holy priesthood, (Lachmann after Codd. A. B. C. reads *εἰς ἱεράτευμα*,—the end of building,) a holy community of priests. "Under the Old Covenant, Jehovah had His house and His priests, who served Him in His house; the Church fulfils both purposes under the New, being both His house and His holy priesthood." Wiesinger. The expression alludes to Ex. xix. 6.—2 Chron. xxix. 11. "The Lord hath chosen you to stand before Him, to serve Him, and that ye should minister unto Him and burn incense." This applies to all Christians. All believers of the New Testament are anointed priests by the Holy Ghost. The priesthood is called *ἅγιον*, because they are consecrated to God, cleansed by the blood of Christ and studious of a holy conversation. Their activity consists in offering spiritual sacrifices.

To offer up spiritual sacrifices, etc., *Ἀναφέρειν* to carry up to the altar; cf. v. 24; Heb. vii. 27; xiii. 15; Jas. ii. 21, elsewhere *προσφέρειν*, to take to God, Heb. v. 7. These sacrifices are spiritual, in opposition to the animal sacrifices of the Old Testament, and correspond to the Being of God, who is a Spirit, and to the spiritual house in which they are offered; they are wrought by the Spirit of God, and must be spiritually offered. This spiritual sacrifice necessitates voluntary surrender to the service of God, and approaching Him spiritually; and consists above all things in that believers should, according to Rom. xii. 1, present to the service of their God and Saviour, their bodies with all its members and powers, eyes and ears, mouth and tongue, hands and feet, and themselves, with all they have and are, and that not only once at their first conversion, but daily, Luke ix. 23. Again, as the burning of incense was connected with the sacrifices of the Old Testament, so the incense of prayer, Rev. viii. 3. 4, and especially the lip-sacrifice of praise, Heb. xiii. 15; Ps. l. 14, are integral parts of the sacrifices of the New Testament. They moreover include the sacrifices of love and charity; if Christians gladly communicate their temporal possessions, seek their neighbours' good at the loss of personal advantage, and are prepared to give their life for the brethren, 1 Jno. iii. 16; Heb. xiii. 16; Phil. iv. 18. But since these sacrifices are always imperfect and affected by manifold infirmities, they cannot be acceptable to God unless offered through Him in whom God is perfectly pleased. Hence the annexed sentence, *εὐπροσδέκτους*, *Θεῷ διὰ*, which last word is not to be joined with *ἀνενέγκαι*, but with *εὐπροσδέκτους* in the sense of taking *through*, through the mediation of Christ, that is, through His goodness, power, advocacy and merits, cf. Eph. i. 6. [But, on the other hand, joining *διὰ κ.τ.λ.* with *ἀνενέγκαι* is supported by the analogy of Heb. xiii. 15; and preferred by Grotius, Aret., de Wette, Huther, Wiesinger and Alford, who consider the former construction inadequate to the weighty character of the words, and would seem to put them in the wrong place, seeing that not merely the acceptability, but the very existence and possibility of offering of those sacrifices, depends on the mediation of the great High Priest.—M.]

Ver. 6. **Because also it is contained in Scripture.**—The Apostle again returns to the figure of the living stone, and supports it by a free and somewhat abbreviated quotation from Is. xxviii. 16.—*περιέχει* for *περιέχεται* as some verbs are used both in a reflexive and a passive sense. Winer, p. 267, 2d Eng. edition. Steiger adduces a passage from Josephus.

ἀκρογωνιαῖος λίθον, a corner-stone of the foundation which unites two walls. Similarly Christ also is the connecting link of the Old and New Testaments, of Jews and Gentiles; *ἐκλεκτόν* see v. 4. In the prophetical passage, the primary reference appears to be to a king of the house of David, but the Spirit points to the Messiah, according to the all but unanimous opinion of ancient commentators; the New Testament also renders that opinion necessary. Is. viii. 14, describes Jehovah Himself as a stone of stumbling to those who do not let Him be their fear; and at Matt. xxi. 42, our Lord applies to Himself the words of Ps. cxviii. 22. *ἐκλεκτόν, ἔντιμον* is repeated by the Apostle in order to show how precious and valuable this corner-stone is to him.

ὁ πιστεύων; the idea of confiding predominates here; hence the preposition *ἐπί* instead of *εἰς* or *ἐν*. In Hebrew הֶאֱמִין to build on something, to stand fast. The passage Is. xxviii. 16, reads, "he that believeth shall not make haste," (*i. e.*, fly like a coward who throws away his arms.) Peter expresses a more general sense, he shall not be ashamed; his hopes shall not make him ashamed. "The precious corner-stone assures an eternal state of grace and salvation." Roos. It was laid at the incarnation, and especially at the resurrection of Jesus.

Ver. 7. **To you then, who believe, is the honour**, etc.—The sense of *ἡ τιμή* is determined by the antithesis to the preceding *καταισχυνθῇ*, and at the same time refers back to *ἔντιμος*, while the part of unbelievers is nothing but shame, faith is to you honour and glory, cf. ch. i. 7; ii. 9. This dignity is farther enlarged upon at v. 9; but the relation of unbelievers to Christ has first to be discussed.

ἀπειθεῖν relates as much to promises and facts as to precepts, cf. Heb. iii. 18. 19; iv. 2. 3. 6; Jno. iii. 36; Acts xiv. 2; xvii. 5; Rom. ii. 8; x. 21; xi. 30; the contrast in this place gives prominence to the former relation.

λίθον, literally taken from the LXX. version of Ps. cxviii. 22. Here also *λίθος* is in the Accusa-

tive. This case may have been retained with reference to τίθημι in v. 6. (Lachmann reads λίθος.)

οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, the chiefs, the dignitaries of the Jewish state are the builders, who tear up the foundation. "Whenever we see the dignitaries rise against Christ, we will call to mind the prediction of David, that the stone is rejected by the builders." Calvin, cf. Rom. xi. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 15. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23.—οὗτος, emphatically just this one and no other.

εἰς expresses the destination and development towards the foundation-stone. Since His resurrection, He stands as the rock supporting His Church, but as a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to unbelievers, according to Is. viii. 14.

Ver. 8. **A stone of stumbling—who stumble.**—πρόσκομμα, a collision producing hurt or injury, נֶגֶף.—σκάνδαλον, properly the catch in the trap, holding the bait, then the trap itself; figuratively, whatever causes to fall, seduces and involves men in sin and calamity. The running and stumbling against a thing is followed by falling. Ruin as the consequence of unbelief stands in contrast with the honour in store for believers, cf. Luke ii. 34; xx. 17; Matt. xxi. 42–44; Rom. ix. 32. The meaning is more than mere subjective taking offence and being vexed, as the sequel shows, not=ἀπειθεῖν.—οἱ προσκόπτουσιν, relates to ἀπειθοῦντες, who stumble while and because they do not believe the word.—προσκόπτουσιν must not be joined with λόγῳ, for it has already its object—*i. e.*, Christ. Grotius erroneously confines himself to the temporal punishment of the Jews, whereas the reference is plain to whatever misery and ruin follows the rejection of Christ.

Whereunto they were also appointed.—εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν relates to the foregoing principal verb, to προσκόπτειν. Grotius rightly: "Unbelievers are appointed for this very thing that they stumble, endure the most grievous punishment for their unbelief." τίθημι applied to the temporal acts of God, not to His eternal decrees and ordinances, cf. Jno. xv. 16; Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 6; Ps. lxvi. 9 in LXX.; 1 Thess. v. 9. It denotes placing, setting in a definite situation, in certain circumstances, which often carry great dangers along with great disadvantages. Roos observes: "Had those unbelievers died in infancy, or had they been born deaf, or among ignorant heathen, they could not thus stumble. Had Caiaphas, Judas Iscariot and others been born several centuries sooner, they could not have so wofully sinned against the Son of God. Man is not wronged in being thus set among inestimable benefits and awful dangers; he is only to seize the benefits, to believe the word; if he is unwilling to do so, his condemnation is perfectly just." Having once voluntarily surrendered themselves to unbelief, their stumbling is neither accidental nor optional, but it contains besides the natural connection also a Divine and inevitable arrangement: "He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption," Gal. vi. 8. Yea, God punishes sin with sin, unbelief with unbelief, if men wantonly repel grace and love darkness more than light. With this explanation we reject the expositions of the Calvinists, *e. g.*, that of Aretius; "Satan and their native evil have set them not to believe," and that of Beza: "That some are rejected not because of their foreseen sins, but because of the good pleasure of the Divine will." Cf. on the other hand, Rom. x. 11–18; xvi. 26; 1 Tim. ii. 4; Tit. ii. 11. The artificial exposition of Cornelius a Lapide is equally inadmissible, "They also were set (*positi*) to believe in Christ, but they refuse faith, just because they will not believe." The parallelism, already noticed by Gerhard, ought not to be passed over, that God sets (appoints) Christ as the foundation and corner-stone of the τιμή for believers; while unbelievers are set (appointed) to stumble at this corner-stone, which is to them a stone of stumbling, *vide* Weiss.

Ver. 9. **But ye are - - a people for acquisition.**—With reference to v. 5, the Apostle describes the glory of the Christian state as contrasted with the lot of unbelievers, both because of their guilt and in accordance with the Divine appointment. The first and last of the predicates used are taken from Is. xliii. 20, in LXX.; the others refer to Ex. xix. 6. γένος, denotes a whole united by natural relationship, community of origin among several parts of a people. Applied to the Christian Church, it signifies the totality of those begotten of the same incorruptible seed, and having one Spiritual Father, ch. i. 3. 23; 1 Jno. v. 1.

ἐκλεκτόν, similar to the Jewish Church of the posterity of Abraham and Jacob, the Christian Church is a company chosen out of the great mass of humanity, destined to salvation and glory and resting on a foundation stone which is also ἐκλεκτός, v. 4. They constitute a royal priesthood just because they belong to the one family of the children of the great God. The Hebrew has "a kingdom of priests," wherein God the King governs and animates all things. The priestly character is, however, the leading idea. You all may freely draw near to God, sacrificing, praying, and blessing, cf. Rev. i. 6; v. 10. But because you have community of life with Him, and should be the image of Him who rules at the right hand of the Majesty, ch. iii. 22, you enjoy in Him also the prerogatives of royalty and government. Even now you must no longer serve the world, with Christ you may overcome the flesh, the world and the devil; your position as rulers will hereafter become more manifest to yourselves and to the world. In you shall be completely fulfilled what in the faithful of Israel could be realized only in feeble beginnings. Cf. Is. lxi. 6; Ps. cxlviii. 14. Grotius quotes the saying of Cicero that it is a royal thing to be the servant of no passion.

ἔθνος ἅγιον. As Israel was, among the many nations of the world, separated and consecrated to God, Ex. xix. 6; Deut. vii. 6, so are you in a much higher sense a holy congregation in the midst of this sin-stained world, you are cleansed by the blood of Christ, sanctified by the Spirit of God, ch. i. 2, and bidden to strive indefatigably for holiness by renouncing the world and growing in brotherly love, ch. i. 22.

λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν=עַם סְגֻלָּה, a people acquired for possession, is the last title of honour, Ex. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6; Mal. iii. 17. Tit. ii. 14; Is. xliii. 21. ὢν may be understood. λαὸς

as exposed to ἔθνος may be designed to give prominence to the ideas of subordination to the King and of classification according to office and station, while ἔθνος suggests the idea of external relations and national habits. Some take περιποίησις actively for acquiring, as in 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39, in the sense of the people destined, to acquire the glorious inheritance of God; but the reference to the Old Testament and the absence of an object in the passage under notice, which elsewhere uniformly accompanies it, forbids such an interpretation. As God had acquired the people of Israel by taking them from the Egyptian house of bondage, so He has acquired the Church of the New Testament by the blood of his Son.—Following Is. xliii. 20, the Apostle next specifies the end for which God did choose them as His own and accord to them such high immunities, not that they should seek therein their own glory, but that they should glorify God. Cf. Matt. v. 16. The construction is similar to that of ἀνενέγκαι in v. 5.

That ye should publish, etc.—ἐξαγγείλητε= to publish forth, to tell out, to give wide-spread publicity to what takes place within, cf. Tit. ii. 14; Eph. ii. 10. This must take place by word and deed, not only by called teachers but by the entire community of believers.

The virtues.—ἀρετή, although of frequent use in the writings of the Greek philosophers, occurs in the New Testament, besides this passage, only in Phil. iv. 8; 2 Pet. i. 3, 5. The word used in the parallel passage of the Old Testament is תְּהִלָּתִי, my praise, cf. Is. xlviii. 8. 12 in LXX. The ἀρεταί of God are, as Gerhard rightly explains, those attributes of God which shine forth from the work of our free calling and the whole contrivance of our salvation. The connection suggests more particularly His Omnipotence which removes every obstacle, and His mercy which condescends to the most degraded slave of sin. The last attribute, in particular, was expressed in the appearing of Christ. Believing congregations should be both the trumpets and mirrors thereof.

καλεῖν, elsewhere applied to the call of the Apostolate, Matt. iv. 21; Mk. i. 19; Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 15; 1 Cor. i. 1; then to invitations to enter into the kingdom of God, Lke. v. 32; 1 Cor. i. 9; Rev. xix. 9; Mtt. xxii. 14; ix. 13; Lke. xiv. 24; v. 32; Rom. viii. 30; ix. 12. 24; 1 Cor. i. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 7; v. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 14; that is, the kingdom of grace and glory. 1 Thess. ii. 12; 1 Tim. vi. 12; Heb. ix. 15; 1 Pet. v. 10. This invitation is mostly effected by the preaching of the Gospel, but sometimes also by God addressing men personally and calling them by their names, Gen. xii. 1; Ex. xxxi. 2; Is. xiii. 3; Acts ix. 4, and by the efficient working of His Spirit in their hearts. God the Father, the God of all grace is here, as elsewhere, He who calls, 1 Cor. i. 9; Gal. i. 15; 1 Pet. v. 10. He thus realizes in *time* (in this present life) the antetemporal (the eternal) act of election.

The darkness is, according to Flacius, the kingdom of darkness and that most sad condition which belongs to all men before they come to Christ. It comprises both ignorance of God and the greatest unrighteousness, the slavery of Satan, and lastly, all kinds of punishment, the curse and wrath of God, and, we may add, the anxious unrest and torment of conscience. This figure being applied to the Jews in the Old Testament, Ps. cvii. 10; Is. ix. 2, affords no clue, that Peter was addressing former pagans. Opposed to darkness is the wonderful light of God, who Himself is Light as to His Being. It translates believers into His holy and blessed communion of light; their understanding is therein enlightened, their will sanctified and their conscience filled with peace. It is a wonderful Light as to origin, nature and effect, since it makes of sinners the children of God. "It discovers wonderful things and cannot be seen by the worldly-minded." Roos. "It is wonderful, just as to one coming out of long darkness the light of day would be wonderful." de Wette.

VER. 10. **Which in time past—but now compassionated.**—The remembrance of what they had once been, must deepen the sense of gratitude on the part of the readers of the Epistle. Peter cites freely Hos. ii. 23, where, of the people in their then condition, it is said that they were not the people of God, but that in the days of Messiah, God would say unto them, "Thou art my people." The passage in Hosea manifestly refers to Israel. The prophecy met its fulfilment whenever a Jewish congregation joined Christianity. If the meaning were the substitution of a new Christian people, a people either composed of Jews and Gentiles, or mainly and by way of preference of Gentiles—for the people of Israel—those promises would either still remain unfulfilled, or be fulfilled in a way that needed, after the manner of Paul, to be more clearly defined and substantiated. Οὐ λαός not only no people of God but the very opposite. Ἐλεηθέντες. "The Aorist denotes the historical fact, the act of Divine compassion to have really taken place." Steiger.—οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, a long time before they had, under the Divine judgments, been given over to sin and its fruit of corruption.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It would be erroneous to represent the nature of regeneration as a state out of which whatever is good is spontaneously flowing, as water flows from a strong fountain; the new man needs constant growth in all his powers. The light of his knowledge must deepen and increase; his will must become more firm and decided; he must grow in love, hope, patience and all other virtues, Heb. vi. 1; Eph. iv. 15; 1 Thes. iv. 1, 10; Phil. iii. 12. This necessitates exhortation on the part of others, and the regenerate must (of course in the spirit of the Gospel, for the flesh is ever warring against the spirit) coerce himself to do good. "A Christian is in process of being, not already completed. Consequently, a Christian is not a Christian, that is, one who thinks that he is already a Christian, whereas he is to become one, is nothing. For we strive to get to heaven, but are not yet in heaven." Luther.

2. Christianity is not satisfied with partial and superficial improvements; it demands inflexible severity toward the old man, and insists upon it that impurity in every shape and form shall be

exposed and struggled with, v. 1.—The progress of the Christian life corresponds every way to its beginning. He that in a first repentance has been awakened from spiritual sleep, must every day rise anew from sleep; he that has put on Christ in faith, must daily put Him on more thoroughly. This is necessary because the old man exists alongside the new, although the dominion of the former be broken.

3. The means whereby the new man is nourished and furthered is none other than that to which he owes his existence. He must grow out of (ἐκ) God, His spirit, and His word. It is a most dangerous opinion for any to hold that he has inwardly appropriated so much of the Divine word as to be able to dispense with the outward word. He that despises this may soon be punished by God, in that He will so effectually deprive him of His light and strength as to induce him to regard as Divine revelations his own vain imaginings and foolish dreams.—Wiesinger says: "The Christian may measure his love of God by his love of the *word* of God; it is his personal experience of the love of God that draws him to the word, and what he seeks is an ever-increasing, ever-deepening experience of the χρηστότης of the Lord. Inquiry led by such an impulse of personal communion with the Lord contains within itself its own rule and corrective, a power which gathers together into one centre of life all the varying phases of the Scriptures, and guards them from being shattered and alienated."

4. A spiritual house, a temple, must also have a priestly people, v. 4. The priestly consecration of the New Testament consists in that we seize by the self-surrender of true faith the true sin-offering and atonement made on Golgotha, and offered and presented to us in the means of grace. First comes the sin-offering, then the burnt-offering, then the thank-offering; hence none can live in the service and to the praise of God unless he first have seized, by the true burnt-offering of faith, the true sin-offering of Christ, and unless his whole life become (working outwardly from within) one whole thank-offering, one whole and undivided act of worship. The real burnt-offering is thenceforth repentance and faith, wherein man dies daily with the right sin-offering of Christ, and daily revives, and suffers himself and his whole life to be possessed of God, by being refined, purified and consumed in the fire of the Holy Ghost." Kliefoth. The general priesthood of Christians applies only to converted, believing and living Christians, and implies that there is no class or state of Christians privileged with exclusive mediation of salvation. Luther has powerfully brought out this doctrine in connection with justification, and Spener propounded it anew. But God has likewise instituted for the church an office for the administration of the means of grace, a clearly defined service to be committed to certain persons, which is evident from 2 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Matt. xxviii. 19. 20; Jas. iii. 1; 1 Cor. xiv. 5.

5. The Divine pleasure rests on the spiritual sacrifices of the priests of the New Testament, only for the sake of Christ; where this truth is sincerely held, neither self-righteousness, nor despondency, its twin sister, can maintain their ground.

6. The nature of Christ reflects itself in believers. They are, v. 5, stones, temples, priests. Every stone is, as it were, a temple by itself; many houses of God constitute the One Church of Christ.

7. Holy Scripture is silent concerning the predestination of individuals to unbelief, sin and damnation, although it teaches that God has (temporally) concluded all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all, Rom. xi. 32.

8. With the Reformers, we should draw the true idea of the Christian Church from v. 9, although it applies only to a small fraction of the degenerate Christendom of the present. The ungodly are only in appearance and name, not in truth and in deed, members of the Church.

9. We learn from v. 9 that there is no antithesis between the New Testament and the Old, provided the latter be treated according to its kernel and substance; Peter comprises both as a unit, but at the same time gives uniform prominence to the spirituality and intrinsicality of Christianity, and specifies a spiritual house, spiritual sacrifices and living stones; so that the Old Testament is represented by him as the Divinely appointed threshold and porch of the New. The province of bringing out the contrast between the Old Testament and the New was left to St. Paul.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Ver. 1. Which are the things that kill brotherly love and ought therefore earnestly to be fought against and laid aside?—Growth in Christian perfection: (*a*) its soil; (*b*) its necessity; (*c*) its means.—Love of the Divinely given means of grace both the mark and task of the new man.—The foundation, on which all Christian exhortations are resting. — The true Church is the mother, nourishing her children with the pure milk of the Divine word.—Jesus, the sinner's cordial and delight in life, suffering and dying.—Christ, the living stone, ever living and animating His people.—Christians are living stones in the building of the kingdom of God: 1. What does it mean? 2 What is necessary to it? 3. What advantage does it bring?—The Christian state a holy priesthood: 1. Its dignity; 2. Its duties.—The two-fold destination of the Church's corner-stone.—Of the vessels of wrath set (prepared) for condemnation.—The chosen generation of the children of God: 1. Their election; 2. Their destination.—Only God's people is a people indeed.

Starke:—The punishment of sin is affected by regeneration, for this must supply us with the ability to avoid evil.—He that betrays attachment to some one darling sin to which natural naughtiness, habit, or manner of life render him peculiarly liable, gives proof that he is not yet in earnest as to his sanctification.—Sin is an arch-deceiver; let every man take care not to be deceived, and not to regard evil and harmful as good and harmless.—The longer and the more we partake of the sweet milk of the Gospel, the more do we increase in the spirit.—Faith gives us some taste of the grace, mercy and loving-kindness of God, Ps. xxxiv. 9.—He that tastes the goodness of God must show it in loving

converse with his neighbour.—Well built on Christ; who can destroy this temple? Matt. xvi. 18. In this temple offer diligently the incense of your prayer and sacrifice.—Good works are well pleasing to God, not because of their perfection, but because of Christ the Beloved, for they are wrought in God, Jno. iii. 21.—Consider the cause and the order of salvation; Christ is the cause, faith the order; both must go together or salvation is impossible, Jno. iii. 36.—Those who reject Christ lose their life, but do neither hurt Him nor His Gospel any more than a well-secured corner-stone can be hurt by those who stumble at it.—The great glory of believers:—they have consolation and joy in life and death.—The unconverted are abominable to God, the converted precious and acceptable.

Lisco:—Sincere repentance: (*a*) its nature; (*b*) its motive.—The blessed communion with Christ Jesus.—The exalted dignity of the Christian Church.—The Christian's life of faith.—The eternally immovable foundation of the kingdom of heaven.—Christ stands in a contrasted relation to man.—The Apostle's exhortation that we should build up ourselves.

Leighton:—Vv. 21. 2. The apostle requires these two things: 1. The innocency of children; 2. The appetite of children.—Epictetus says: "Every thing hath two handles." The art of taking things by the better side, which charity always doth, would save much of those janglings and heart-burnings that so abound in the world.—There is none comes to the school of Christ, suiting the philosopher's word, *ut fabula rasa*, as blank paper to receive His doctrine, but, on the contrary, all scribbled and blurred with such base habits as these—malice, hypocrisy, envy, etc.—These two are necessary conditions of good nourishment: 1. That the food be good and wholesome; 2. That the inward constitution of them that use it be so, too.—*Iisdem alimur ex quibus constamus.*—Pure and unmixed, as milk drawn immediately from the breast; the pure word of God without the mixture, not only of error, but of all other composition of vain, unprofitable subjects or affected human eloquence, such as become not the majesty and gravity of God's word, 1 Pet. iv. 11.—"Desire the sincere milk": 1. It should be natural; 2. earnest; 3. constant.

Ver. 3. The free grace of God was given to be tasted in the promises, before the coming of Christ in the flesh, but being accomplished in His coming, then was the sweetness of grace made more sensible; then was it more fully broached and let out to the elect world, when He was pierced on the cross and His blood poured forth for our redemption. *Through those holes of his wounds may we draw and taste that the Lord is gracious*, says St. Augustin.—"If ye have tasted." There must be, 1. a firm believing the truth of the promises wherein the free grace of God is expressed and exhibited to us; 2. a particular application or attraction of that grace to ourselves, which is as the drawing those breasts of consolation, Is. lxvi. 11, namely, the promises contained in both Testaments; 3. there is a sense of the sweetness of that peace being applied or drawn into the soul, and that is properly this taste.

Vv. 4. 5. 1. The nature of the building: It is a spiritual building; having this privilege that it is *tota in toto et tota in qualibet parte*. The Hebrew for the word for *palace* and *temple* is one. 2. The materials of it. 3. The structure or way of building it.—First coming and then built up.—As these stones are built on Christ by faith, so they are cemented one to another by love.—"A holy priesthood": 1. The office; 2. The service of that office; 3. The success of that service.—[Apparent paradox: God claims the heart *whole* and yet *broken*.—M.]

Ver. 6. In these words are five things: 1. This foundation stone; 2. The laying of it; 3. The building on it; 4. The firmness of this building; 5. The greatness and excellence of the whole work.—What Seneca says of wisdom is true of faith: "*Puto multos potuisse ad sapientiam pervenire, nisi putassent se jam pervenisse.*"

Ver. 9. 1. The estate of Christians; 2. Its opposition to the state of unbelievers; 3. The end of it. 'Generation': They are of one nation, belonging to the same blessed land of promise, all citizens of the new *Jerusalem*, yea, all children of the same family, whereof Jesus Christ, the *root of Jesse*, is the stock, who is the *great king* and the *great High-priest*, and thus they are a *royal priesthood.*—They resemble in their spiritual state the Levitical priesthood: 1. In their consecration: (*a*) they were washed, cf. Rev. i. 5; (*b*) The washing was accompanied by sacrifice [Christ's blood was shed in sacrifice]; (*c*) They were anointed [Christians are anointed with the gifts of the Spirit]; (*d*) They were clothed in pure garments, Ps. cxxxii. 9; (*e*) They had offerings put into their hands. 2. In their services: (*a*) They had charge of the sanctuary [Christians have charge of their hearts]; (*b*) They were to bless the people [the prayers of Christians convey blessings to the world]. 3. In their course of life: [The life of Christians is regulated by a code of holy laws.—M.]

[Baxter:—Ver. 2. Alas what a multitude of dwarfs has Christ, that are but like infants, though they have numbered ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or even sixty years of spiritual life.—M.]

[John Glas:—Ver. 9. "There is now no more any place on earth where the whole Church assembles for worship; but they all assemble in the heavenly Jerusalem, where Jesus is, the antitype of that on earth, in which the Church of Israel assembled, and toward which they worshipped from all corners of the land. Here they on earth have their conversation, Phil. iii. 20; and unto that place the tribes of God go up now worshipping God, all serving in newness of the Spirit; and there are no worshippers now but spiritual worshippers. Thus there is an end put to all controversies about earthly holy places and temples of God made with hands."—M.]

[Ver. 2. The early Christians administered milk and honey, which was the ordinary food of infants, to such as were newly received into the Church; showing them by this sign that by their baptism they were born again, and bound to manifest the simplicity and innocence of infants in their life and conversation.—M.]

[Mosheim:—Ver. 8. "The stone of stumbling and rock of offence," as the prophet affirms, is the Lord of Hosts Himself; but this "stone of stumbling and rock of offence," as asserted by the

Apostle, is no other than Christ, the same stone which the builders refused. Therefore Christ is the Lord of Hosts Himself. If the Scripture, thus compared with itself, be drawn up into an argument, the conclusion may indeed be denied, and so may the whole Bible, but it cannot be answered."—M.]

[JONES OF NAYLAND:—"Whereunto they were also appointed." Not appointed to be disobedient, but appointed, since they would be disobedient, to take their own course and the consequences of it; to stumble and fall at difficulties, of which they would easily have seen the proper solution, and so got over them unhurt, had they but modestly begged, and dutifully followed, the Divine illumination."—M.]

[ABP. SECKER:—Query: "What is the origin of the metaphor 'living stones', as applied to Christians?"—M.]

[CLARKE suggests a common Hebrew root בָּנָה to build of בֵּן a son, בַּת a daughter, בַּיִת a house and אֶבֶן a stone. A house (בַּיִת) is built of stones (אֲבָנִים), a house or family, also called בַּיִת consists of sons (בָּנִים) and daughters (בָּנוֹת). The house of God is the Church which rests on Christ, the Living Stone, and Christians are members of Christ, drawing their life from Him and resting on Him, and therefore *living stones*.—M.].

CHAPTER II. 11–17.

ANALYSIS:—Exhortation to show our election of grace in the various relations of the life of our pilgrimage, primarily with respect to established authority.

11 Dearly beloved, I beseech *you* as [1]strangers and pilgrims,[2] abstain from fleshly
12 lusts, which war against the soul; Having your conversation[3] honest among the Gen-
tiles: that, [4]whereas they speak against you as evil doers, they may by *your* good
13 works,[5] which they shall behold,[6] glorify God in the day of visitation. Submit your-
selves[7] to every ordinance of man[8] for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king,[9] as
14 supreme;[10] Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by[11] him for the punishment
15 of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well.[12] For so is the will of God,
16 that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men:[13] As free,
and not using[14] *your* liberty[15] for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God.
17 Honour[16] all *men*. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.

Verse 11. [[1] Sojourners and strangers; German: guests and strangers.—M.]
[2] Tisch., 7th ed., reads ἀπέχεσθαι, but ἀπέχεσθε is well supported. [A. C. L. Syr. Copt. Aeth.—M.]
Verse 12. [[3] καλήν—good, comely.—M.]
[[4] ἐν ᾧ—in the matter which.—M.]
[[5] ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων—for your good works' sake.—M.]
[6] Tisch. prefers ἐποπτεύοντες. So Cod. Sin. Render "which they see", or "being spectators of them."—M.]
[Cod. Sin. *δοξασουτρεμουσιν. *sic*.—M.]
Verse 13. [[7] ὑποτάγητε, Aor. Pass.—be subjected.—M.]
[[8] Human institution; German: ordinance, order.—M.]
[κτίσιν ἀνθρωπίνην τὰς ἀρχὰς λέγει τὰς χειροτονητὰς ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων, ἢ καὶ αὐτοὺς βασιλεῖς, καθότι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἐτάχθησαν ἤτοι ἐτέθησαν. Oecum.—M.]
[[9] Taking, without the Article.—M.]
[[10] ὑπερέχοντι, *præcellenti*—super-eminent.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. omits οὖν with A. B. C. al. *πάσῃ.—M.]
Verse 14. [[11] διά—through.—M.]
[[12] Well-doers as contrasted with evil-doers.—M.]
Verse 15. [[13] Of *the* foolish men referred to in ver. 12.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. reads φιμοῖν.—M.]
Verse 16. [[14] ὡς belongs to ἔχοντες, not to ἐπικάλυμμα.—M.]
[[15] ἐλεύθεροι—free, ἐλευθερία—freedom.—M.]
[Translate the whole verse: "as free, and not as having your freedom for a cover of malignity, but as the servants of God."—M.]
[Cod. Sin. Θεοῦ δοῦλοι.—M.]
Verse 17. [[16] Give honour to all men. *Suum cuique*.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 11. **I exhort you**, etc.—This exhortation alludes to ch. i. 1, and enjoins the cleansing of the soul and a comely behaviour among the Gentiles, on the grounds of their condition of pilgrims.—παροίκους should be joined with ἀπέχεσθαι. πάροικος=one who lives as a stranger or denizen in a country or community; παρεπιδήμος = one who stays in a place for a short time, like travellers on a journey, ch. i. 17. By their present state he reminds them of the general lot of men on earth. "We are in body and soul expatriated; nothing is permanent on earth." Calov. Lasting joys and riches are

only in our true home. It is also befitting that as strangers you should not offend those among whom you live.—ἀπέχεσθαι even stronger than μὴ συσχηματιζόμενοι, ch. i. 14; it denotes inward and outward abstinence.—σαρκικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι= ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σαρκός, Eph. ii. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 18;= κοσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι, Tit. ii. 12; cf. 1 Jno. ii. 16. In a narrower sense it denies all desires and impulses that *seek pasture** in sensual thoughts and gratification—in eating and drinking, and obscenity and incontinence. The primary reference may be to these, but there is also an ulterior reference to those lusts whose seat is rather in the soul than in the body, *e. g.*, hatred, idolatry, wrath, conceit of knowledge, avarice, cf. Gal. v. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 3; Rom. viii. 6; Eph. ii. 3; Col. ii. 18. Consequently all manifestations and motions of the selfishness of man in general. They are said to war against the soul; they go out against it, surround and assault it. Bengel calls this "a great saying"; cf. Jas. iv. 1; Rom. vii. 23. The design is not so much to describe the nature of the lusts as to enforce the exhortation. —κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς. Neither the contrast between flesh and spirit, described by St. Paul, Rom. vii. 14, etc.; Gal. v. 17; nor as Calov and Steiger take it, "they war against the nature of the regenerate soul." The proposition is general, and ψυχή denotes elsewhere the principle of personal life. Ch. i. 9, it is the soul that is to be saved, and ch. i. 22, it is the soul that is to be sanctified through faith. The life of the soul is hidden, hurt and killed by fleshly lusts, cf. Matt. x. 39; xvi. 25; Luke xvii. 33. [Alford remarks, "ψυχή, the man's personal, immortal part, as opposed to his body, his μέλη in which the ἐπιθυμίαι στρατεύονται is held in suspension between influences from above and influences from beneath—drawn up and saved, or drawn down and ruined,—and among its adversaries are those fleshly lusts, warring against it to its ruin."—M.]

VER. 12. **Having your conversation good among the Gentiles.**—ἀναστροφή, ch. i. 14.—ἔχοντες. If we do not read ἀπέχεσθε, the Accusative ought to follow; but sometimes Participles, removed from the verbs by which they are governed, stand in an abnormal case; the *casus rectus* gives greater prominence to an idea, *v.* Winer § 64. 2. Christians are opposed to an ungodly world, and are charged to be the salt and the light of the world, which closely watches them. (Matt. v. 16).—ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν is a hint that the Epistle was addressed to Jewish Christians. The unbelieving Jews are probably reckoned among the ἔθνη; so Weiss.—καλήν. The deeper view of Greek philosophy represented immorality and ugliness, and morality and beauty as convertible ideas.

In the matter in which they speak against you as evil doers.—ἐν ᾧ not: instead of, while, but in the same matter, in the same occasion in which, because of which, they speak against you as evil doers. [The sense is, "that that conduct, which was to them an occasion of speaking against you as evil doers, may by your good works become to them an occasion of glorifying God. Alford.—M.] Join ἐν ᾧ with δοξάσωσι, cf. ch. iii. 16. It was just the good conversation of Christians, their Christian works, judged superficially and referred to evil motives, that gave occasion to the heathen to slander and persecute them. ἐν ᾧ is defined by καλὰ ἔργα, compare in point of language, Rom. ii. 1.—καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν.—Tertullian says: If the Tiber rises to the walls of the city, if the Nile does not irrigate the fields, if an earthquake takes place, if famine or the pestilence arise, they cry forthwith: Away with the Christians to the lions.

For your good works' sake - - glorify.—ἐποπτεύσαντες refers to ἐν ᾧ, from which we must supply τοῦτο. It signifies: to look closely upon a thing in order to see through it. So it was applied to those mysteries which were difficult to explain, cf. ch. iii. 2; Eph. iii. 4. Superficial observers, as appears from the account given by Tacitus, regarded the brotherly love of the Christians as a secret covenant imperilling the state, their decision as obstinacy, their heavenly-mindedness as hatred of the human race. Their departure from the sinful customs of their fathers was treated as contempt for and rejection of all human ordinances, cf. ch. ii. 19, 20; iii. 10–12, 17; iv. 15; ii. 14. A definite date, *e. g.*, the time of the persecutions under Nero, or even under Trajan, can hardly be substantiated. Join ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων to δοξάσωσιν, for the good works' sake, proceeding out of them.

δοξάσωσιν.—Calvin rightly observes that our aim ought not to be to make unbelievers speak and think well of us, but rather to keep before our eyes the glory of God. More correct knowledge may constrain them to glorify God, to give honour to God, of whom believers are said to be the children. Peter evidently thinks of the words of Jesus at Matt. v. 16. Roos adds: In such a case we must not always look for a proper praise of God. Provided people praise the good works, they praise our heavenly Father, as the Author of them, just as he that praises the good manners of a child, virtually bestows praise on his instructor. Although people treat the faith of God's children as superstition and folly, they may for all that praise their works, and thus give glory to God. Justin Martyr supplies an illustration of such δοξάζειν. He confesses that, when still a heathen, he deemed it impossible that the Christians could be addicted to the unnatural vices of which they were accused, because they were so ready to die for Christ.

In the day of visitation.—ἐπισκοπή, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι= פָּקַד denotes both the merciful visitation of God, and His judicial and primitive inquisition; for the former sense cf. Gen. xxi. 1; l. 24; Ex. iii. 16; iv. 31; 1 Sam. ii. 21; Job vii. 18; Lke. i. 68. 78; Acts xv. 14; for the latter, see Jer. ix. 24. 25; xliv. 13; xlvi. 25; ix. 9; Ps. lix. 6; Ex. xx. 5. Commentators are divided, either sense finding many advocates. It is perhaps best to combine both views, as the Apostle himself does not define his meaning, and as both visitations of mercy and wrath, do often occur together. It is by no means an insoluble riddle that unbelievers are made to glorify God by suf-

*The readers of this Commentary will pardon my attempt to give currency to a most striking Germanism; I do so on the supposition that every term of speech which sheds light on the workings of the mind and soul, is a most valuable accession to language.—M.

ferings, since experience shows that in seasons of heavy judgments, stony hearts are sometimes softened and melted. The word ἡμέρᾳ relates, as is often the case, to longer periods of time than a day of twenty-four hours. The allusion here is neither to the day of judgment (as Bede maintains), nor to an investigation of the life of believers on the part of the world (as Roos suggests).

[The day of God's *visitation* in wars, earthquakes, plagues, etc., brought out the faith and love of the *Christians*, as contrasted with that of the *Jews* and *Heathens*. Wordsworth cites the history of the plague at Carthage, in Cyprian's Episcopate, as described by his deacon, Pontius, p. 6. "The majority of our brethren," says Pontius, "took care of every one but *themselves;* by nursing the sick, and watching over them in Christ, they caught the disorder which they healed in others, and breathed their last with joy; some bare in their arms and bosoms the bodies of dead saints, and having closed the eyes of the dying, and bathed their corpses, and performed the last obsequies, received the same treatment at the hands of their brethren. But the *very reverse* of this was done by the *Gentiles;* those who were sinking into sickness, they drove from them; they fled from their dearest friends; they threw them expiring into the streets, and turned from their unburied corpses with looks of execration." See also Cyprian's words in his treatise published on that occasion, *De Mortalitate, sive Peste,* capp. 9. 10: *Mortalitas ista, ut Judæis et Gentilibus et Christi hostibus pestis est, ita Dei servis salutaris excessus est.*—M.]

VER. 13. **Be subjected, therefore, to every human institution,** etc.—From the wholly general precept concerning the conversation of Christians among the heathen, the Apostle, moved by the very common slanders uttered against them, that they were dangerous to the State, and aiming at the overthrow of all the bands of law, takes occasion to descend to the most ordinary duties, to the exhortation of submitting to the secular authority, and of not abusing Christian liberty.

ὑπόταγητε.—The Aorist Pass. is sometimes used in a Middle sense, *v.* Winer.—οὖν primarily connects with v. 12, secondarily with v. 11.*—πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει.—The word κτίσις, like κτίζειν, is generally applied to Divine creations and institutions, or used to denote a creature; but here the adjective ἀνθρωπίνῃ shows that it signifies any institution or appointment irrespective of origin. Limiting κτίσις to the idea of the Divine institution of the world is confusing. The Apostle intends by the use of the adjective ἀνθρωπίνῃ to meet the objection that Christians, in view of their Christian liberty, were bound to obey only authorities immediately appointed by God, because there was much sinfulness mixed up with such human institutions; he further desires to distinguish the Divine ordinance of the State from that of the Church, ch. ii. 5, without, however, denying the mediately Divine institution of the secular power, as Paul avers at Rom. xiii. 1. 2. 4. Flacius rightly remarks: "It is called a human ordinance because secular constitutions do not originate in an explicit and specific word of God, as true religion does; but they are rather ordained by man and his agency, at least as far as we are able to judge, that cannot see the hidden sway of God." If this Epistle belongs to the time of Nero, light is shed on the selection of this predicate. Peter may have recollected the words of his Master, Matt. xvii. 26. 27. Luther comments in this respect as follows: "Although you are free in all externals (for you are Christians) and ought not be forced by law to be subjected to secular rule (for there is no law for the just [*i. e.*, to the justified—M.]), yet you ought spontaneously to yield a ready and uncoerced obedience, not because necessity compels you, but that you may please God, and benefit your neighbour. Thus did Christ act, as we read, Matt. xvii."—πάσῃ—be it Heathen, Jewish, or Christian authority; be it this or that constitution.

[Wordsworth:—"Water may be made to assume different *forms*, in fountains and cascades, and be made to flow in different *channels* or *aqueducts*, by *the hand of man;* but the *element* itself, which flows in them, is from *God.* So again, marble may be hewn by man's hand into different *shapes:* under the sculptor's chisel it may become a statue, a frieze or sarcophagus, but the marble itself is from the *quarry,* it is from the creative hand of *God.*—So it is with the civil power. The *form* which power may assume, and the *person* who may be appointed to exercise it, may be κτίσεις ἀνθρώπιναι, ordinances of *man;* but the *authority* itself (ἐξουσία) is from *God.* Consequently, as St. Peter teaches, we are bound to *submit* to every *ordinance of man,* in all lawful things, "*for the Lord's sake,*" whose ministers and vicegerents our rulers are; and, as St. Paul declares, "he that resisteth the authority, resisteth *the ordinance of God,* and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." See Rom. xiii. 1–3.—M.]

For the Lord's sake.—Probably to be understood of God the Father, who had been mentioned in v. 12, although v. 8, and elsewhere in Peter, as in Paul, Christ is called Lord. [But is not the reference rather to Christ? For, 1. κύριος with Peter always describes Christ, except in quotations from the O. T. (Alford): 2. Christians derive their liberty from their union to Christ.—M.] The sense is: because God demands it, because He has founded this institution, Rom. xiii. 1. 5. This defines, also, the limits of Christian subjection: the duty of obedience ceases, where God from heaven decisively forbids it, Acts iv. 19; v. 29. The Apostle specifies two classes of political powers whom Christians are bound to obey: first, the king or emperor, second, his ambassadors or representatives. The Jews and the Greeks called the Roman Imperator, king.—ὡς ὑπερέχοντι.—ὡς denotes a well known reason. ὑπερέχοντι, wielding the highest sovereign power on earth. Otherwise, 1 Tim. ii. 1. Bengel rightly: *supereminens.*—αὐτου connects, of course, with βασιλεῖ, not with κύριος. "In inferior powers, we must see and honour the king, in the king, God Himself." Gerhard. The ethical purpose of the power wielded by all authorities is to punish evil-doers, and to recognize the good with marks of praise and approbation, cf. Rom. xiii. 3. 4. Calov cites the language of

* οὖν is wanting in A. B. C. and other Manuscripts.

Plato, that rewards and punishments keep the state together, and quotes from Cicero the saying of Solon, that the state is best governed if the good are attracted by rewards and the evil kept in bounds by punishment.—*ἐκδίκησις*, not execution of the laws, but punishment, vengeance.—*κακοποιῶν*, to be taken in a general, objectively ethical sense, and to be interpreted by ch. iv. 15, which treats of murderers and other malefactors. This passage contains not the faintest reference, altogether, to the character of Christians, as drawn by Suetonius and Tacitus, to wit, that they were political offenders. How could the Apostle have subscribed to such a delineation of their character! This passage, therefore, cannot be used to determine the date of the Epistle.—*ἔπαινος*, recognition by word and deed, praise, protection and promotion.

VER. 15. **For so is the will of God - - men.**—Gerhard:—Even though your innocence and obedience are insufficient to effect the conversion of others or their praising God, you will be able, according to the will of God, to silence blasphemers.—*οὕτως ἐστί*, after this manner, is the will of God. [Then follows what the will of God is in this direction, viz.: *ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φιμοῦν κ. τ. λ.*—M.]—*φιμοῦν* from *φιμός*, a muzzle, to muzzle, to shut up the mouth, as with a muzzle, cf. Deut. xxv. 4; Sir. xx. 31.—This ignorance *originated* in the corruption of the heart, and in its turn *influenced* it, (ch. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 34; Jno. xvi. 3). It was marked by varying degrees of guilt. Paul contrasts the knowledge of the Divine will with this state of ignorance, Eph. v. 17. Because they are blind as to Divine things, they are unable to understand our manner of conversation.

[Wordsworth:—"Christ was crucified by the power of Rome, as He had foretold that He would be (Matt. xx. 19). St. Peter and St. Paul, as they also foreknew, were martyred by Rome; but yet they preached submission to Rome."—M.]

VER. 16. **As free - - God.**—*ὡς ἐλεύθεροι* may best be construed as the antecedent of the next verse, but only of its first member, *πάντας τιμήσατε*. To construe it with v. 15 would require *ἐλευθέρους*. [But even this limitation to the first member of v. 17 renders such a construction hardly tenable. The supposition of the contrary seems to establish its untenableness. Does my freedom absolve me from the obligation of honouring all men? Am I not bound, on the general ground of Christian duty and equity, to give to all their due? On the whole, I consider the explanation of Wiesinger, adopted by Alford, the best, viz.: to regard v. 16 as an epexegesis on v. 15, not carrying on the construction with an Accusative, but with a Nominative, as already in v. 12, and, indeed, even more naturally here, because not the act *consequent* on *ἀγαθοποιεῖν*, as there on *ἀπέχεσθαι*, is specified, but the antecedent state and Christian mode of *ἀγαθοποιεῖν*. For arguments see Wiesinger and Alford.—M.] It is different with v. 12. Such subjection and true Christian liberty are not irreconcilable antagonisms. For the latter, founded on the redemption through Christ, is spiritual in its nature; it delivers us from sin and error, from the world and the devil, and unites us to God and His word by the bands of love, cf. Jno. viii. 32; Rom. vi. 18, 22; Gal. v. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 19. In the sequel Peter cuts off all misunderstanding and abuse of liberty. The Gnostics abused Christian liberty by the commission of all kinds of infamous and criminal indulgences. The Jews, on the plea of being the people of God's inheritance, claimed to be free from the laws of the heathen. On this account we read: "and not as having [=not as those who have—M.] freedom for a cover of malignity." It is uncertain whether (as Cornelius and others suppose) there is here an allusion to the white baptismal robe, which was also a symbol of the liberty obtained through Christ. — *ἐπικάλυμμα* = *παρακάλυμμα*, something spread in order to cover a thing, hence, a cloak, a cover, a veil. Luther says: "If Christian liberty is preached, godless men without faith immediately rush in, and claim to be good Christians because they do not keep the laws of the Pope."—*κακία* should not be explained with Wiesinger in the restricted sense of disobedience to the magistrate, but in a wider sense, just as the antithesis *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* is a more general idea.—*δοῦλοι Θεοῦ*.—To serve God, says Augustine, is the highest liberty. What was expected of Israel as a nation (often called the servant of God, Is. xliv. 1. 21; xlviii. 20; Jerem. xxx. 10); what Jesus was in a peculiar sense (and Peter calls Him so by preference, Acts iii. 13. 26; iv. 27. 30), should be realized in every believer of the New Testament.

VER. 17. **Honour all men.**—The chief duties of a good conversation among the Gentiles are now briefly comprehended, according to the several relations in which they stand.—*τιμήσατε*, Aorist Imper., used of actions that are either rapidly completed and transient, or viewed as occurring but once. Winer § 48, 3, a.

All men.—Not only the chief, but all men. In your intercourse with equals, show to each the respect you owe them, first, as God's creatures, Jas. iii. 9, and, secondly, as having been redeemed by Christ, cf. ch. v. 5. 6; iii. 8; Matt. xx. 26; xxiii. 12; Lke. xiv. 11; xviii. 14; xxii. 26, 27; Mk. x. 43. 44. The passage, Ps. xv. 4, rightly translated, is not in conflict with this exhortation. Paul, in a similar exhortation, takes cognizance of civil position and personal goodness, Rom. xiii. 7. To qualify this passage by limitation is arbitrary. *τιμᾶτε*, from *τίω*, to value, to define and pay the value of a thing or person.

ἀδελφότης, the brotherhood viewed as a whole, all who are, or are called your brothers, cf. ch. i. 22. Because such a disposition of esteem for and brotherly love of all can only flow from a true relation to God, the next exhortation is: "Fear God," cf. ch. i. 17. Holy fear of the majesty of God is peculiarly in place, if you are tempted to abuse your Christian liberty. "He that fears God, loves his brethren, and embraces all mankind with becoming love, will not fail to render also to kings the honour that is due to them." Calvin. Peter probably recollects Prov. xxiv. 21, which defines the same attitude of fearing God and honouring the king. Weiss calls attention to Matt. xxii. 21. [The variations of the Imperative form in this verse are noteworthy and suggestive. *τιμήσατε*, the *Aor. Imper.*, marks the general principle, the following three *Present Imperatives* define its application in particular relations.—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Peter in the second part of the Epistle, ch. ii. 11, resumes the thought that believers are citizens of another fatherland, and only strangers here on earth, cf. ch. i. 1. 4; v. 10; i. 17. This fundamental view of the Apostle runs through the whole Epistle; on it are based the exhortations which follow ch. iv. 6. It must, consequently, be of the highest importance that we should constantly keep up a lively sense of our status as strangers. It belongs to the most noble and powerful incentives to sanctification, cf. 2 Cor. v. 8. 6; Phil. iii. 20.

2. Holy Scripture wisely prescribes no rules as to the best form of constitution: we learn from the Old Testament that the theocratic form of government is, properly speaking, the institution which corresponds to the will of God; this is also the end contemplated by Christianity. God is to be the all-animating principle in those who gladly obey Him, 1 Cor. xv. 28; Rev. xxi. 8; xxii. 3. But this end can be attained only after Satan has been bound, and after the great separation has been consummated, Mal. iv. 2; Matt. xiii. 40, etc. Many, impatiently anxious to anticipate the end towards which the development of the Christian Church is being led, rejected existing forms of government. Hence the Apostle exhorts, substantially, that it is the part of true Christians to be subjected to any human institution, whether monarchical, republican or aristocratic. The only limitation set to obedience to the government is its commanding any thing which militates against the clearly revealed will of God. It is not for us to ask how such and such a ruler did acquire his power, whether the constitution of a state be so framed as to contain the fundamental laws of God for the regulation of human relations, (as some try to press the word κτίσις), but we must obey for the Lord's sake, who says: "By me kings reign and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." Prov. viii. 15. 16. All rebellion against the ordained government is to be repudiated, as our evangelical Church has established it from the beginning, contrary to jesuitico-papistical teaching. [Fronmüller refers to Germany. Those who wish to see the whole subject illustrated on sound Church principles are referred to the Homilies against Wilful Rebellion in the *Book of Homilies*, authoritatively set forth by the Church of England, and received by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States "as an explication of Christian doctrine and instructive in piety and morals."—M.] Rieger capitally observes: In the words "*human* institution or ordinance, the Apostle does not deprive governments of the honour that they are the servants of God, Rom. xiii. 1, etc. The state and office of the government are God-derived; they have, indeed, in course of time, manifold human shapes, and in the hands of men have been variously instituted. But even this human element, so far from serving as a pretext for the withdrawal of submission, should rather be a root of patience, gladly to put up with human and inevitable infirmities, even in this respect."

3. The Christian must adapt himself to every form of government, and, as a pilgrim, finds it not difficult so to do.

4. Every government is bound, for its own interest, to punish the wicked, and to protect the good. An unchristian, unjust government is a sore punishment to a country; but there is no greater evil than anarchy, as Sophocles already perceived.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

What is necessary to walk as a pilgrim on earth? 1. Abstaining from fleshly lusts; 2. Obeying all human governments; 3. Patiently suffering wrong.—Which are the marks that a Christian is a stranger and pilgrim here? Consider, (*a*) his speech; (*b*) his carriage; (*c*) his manners; (*d*) his aims.—The Christian state a continuous warfare, Job vii. 1; Ps. xxiv. 8:—1. the enemies; 2. the weapons; 3. the victory.—Walk as lights in the heathenish-minded world!—The manifold days of visitation.—The Christian's demeanour towards the secular power.—How to shut up most effectually the mouth of the ignorant?—The Pharisaic hearts that make liberty the cloak of maliciousness.—True liberty a blessed bondage before God.—The four main points of a good conversation in this world.—Why and how we should, as Christians, give honour to all men?

Kapff:—What makes up true liberty? 1. To be the servants of God and Jesus; 2. to be subject, for the Lord's sake, to all human authority; 3. to lead a good conversation, as strangers in the world.

Staudt:—Maintaining the state of strangers: 1. In relation to the flesh; 2. In relation to the world.

Starke:—Pilgrim, how long dost thou stay at the inn? Yonder is thy fatherland. Away with the voluptuous joys of the village, through which thou art journeying!—He that would be free from the breaking out of the lusts of the flesh, must seize them by the root and choke them in the beginning.—Fleshly lusts, though they begin sweetly and are soothing to the heart, are the soul's inveterate enemies, and bring forth sin, Jas. i. 15; Sir. xxi. 3.—Fie! Christians like heathen. Beware and pray, "Gracious God, put an end to gross offences."—The more a man is surrounded by false, hostile, watching people, the more must he be on his guard, not only to avoid evil, but the appearance of it, 1 Thess. v. 22.—The pious have always to endure slander, yet their best defence is not in their mouth or pen, but in their works and deeds, v. 15.—A Christian's holy conversation must also aim at the conversion of others, which is realized in the case of some, ch. iii. 1.—The secular power is as much bound to reward virtue as to punish wickedness, Ps. lxxxii. 3. 4; Prov. xx. 26.—Calumnies are best contradicted, if we prove by a holy conversation that they are untrue.—To requite evil with good has generally a good effect.—We are free, but not from the law of Christ and God, 1 Cor. ix. 21.—Christian courtesy tends to good reputation, to the favour and good-will of our neighbour, and to reciprocal good-will and confidence, Rom. xii. 10.—Mark that the fear of God

is mentioned first, the honour of the magistrate afterwards, Acts v. 29.—There are two kingdoms, God's and the emperor's, each must remain within its bounds; God reserves to Himself the soul and conscience; the body, goods and possessions are under the emperor's rule, Matt. xxii. 21.

LISCO:—Walk, as it pleases God.—Which is the deepest foundation of Christian morality?—How does a Christian's liberty exhibit itself?

Basle Collections:—Christian abstinence: 1. its nature; 2. its motives.

[LEIGHTON:—VER. 11. There is a faculty of reproving required in the Ministry, and sometimes a necessity of very sharp rebukes, cutting ones. They that have much of the *spirit of meekness* may have *a rod* by them, too, to use upon necessity; but sure the way of meekness is that they use most willingly.—It was a very wise abridgment that Epictetus made of philosophy, into those two words, *bear and forbear.*—It was the high speech of a heathen, *That he was greater, and born to greater things, than to be a servant to his body;* how much more ought he that is born again to say so, being born heir to "a crown that fadeth not away"! ch. v. 4.—*Fleshly lusts.*—They war against the soul; and their war is made up of stratagem and sleight, for they cannot hurt the soul but by itself. They promise it some contentment, and so gain its consent to serve them and undo itself; they embrace the soul that they may strangle it.—VER. 12. Mark three things, 1. one point of a Christian's ordinary entertainment in the world is, *to be evil spoken of;* 2. Their good use of that evil, *to do the better for it;* 3. The good end and certain effect of their so doing, *the glory of God.*—The goodness or beauty of a Christian's conversation consisting in symmetry and conformity to the word of God as its rule, he ought diligently to study that rule and to square his ways by it; not to walk at random, but to apply that rule to every step at home and abroad, and to be as careful to keep the beauty of his ways unspotted, as those women are of their faces and attire, that are most studious of comeliness.—What have we to do in the world as His creatures, once and again His creatures, His new creatures, *created unto good works*, Eph. ii. 10, but to exercise ourselves in those, and by those to advance His glory?—that all may return to Him, from whom all is, as the rivers run back to the sea, from whence they came.—VER. 15. Whereas those that have most real goodness, delight most to observe what is good and commendable in others, and to pass by their blemishes, it is the true character of vile, unworthy persons (as flies sit upon sores) to skip over all the good that is in men and fasten upon their infirmities.—And this is a wise Christian's way, instead of impatiently fretting at the mistakes or wilful miscensures of men, to keep still on in his calm temper of mind and upright course of life and silent innocence; this, as a rock, breaks the waves into foam that roar about it.—M.]

[WARBURTON:—VER. 13. 14. Reward cannot, properly, be the sanction of *human* laws.—M.]

[HARRINGTON:—To say, because civil magistracy is ordained of God, therefore it cannot be the ordinance of man, is as if you said: God ordained the temple, therefore, it was not built by masons; He ordained the snuffers, therefore, they were not made by a smith.—M.]

[WHATELY:—A *timely*, *steady* and *mild* resistance, on *legal* grounds, to *every* unlawful stretch of power (as in the well-known case of the ship-money) will prove the most effectual means, if *uniformly* resorted to, for preventing the occurrence of those desperate and extreme cases which call for violent and dangerous remedies.—M.]

[M.:—The principle on which we should resist ordinances in conflict with the will of God is *fortiter in re sed leniter in modo.*]

[LUTHER:—VER. 16. Christ's truth maketh us free, not civilly, nor carnally, but divinely. We are made free in such sort, that our conscience is free and quiet, not fearing the wrath of God to come. This is the true and inestimable liberty, to the excellency and majesty of which, if we compare the other, they are but as one drop of water in respect of the ocean. For who is able to express what a thing it is, when a man is assured in his heart that God neither is, nor ever will be angry with him, but will be forever a merciful and loving Father to him, for Christ's sake! This is, indeed, a marvellous and incomprehensible liberty, to have the Most High Sovereign Majesty so favourable to us that He doth not only defend, maintain and succour us in this life, but also, as touching our bodies, will so deliver us as that, though sown in corruption, dishonour and infirmity, they shall rise again in incorruption, and glory, and power. This is an inestimable liberty, that we are made free from the wrath of God forever, and is greatly more valuable than heaven and earth and the created universe. "Blessed is the man who is in such a case; yea, blessed is the man whose God is the Lord."—M.]

[OLSHAUSEN:—*Without* law, or altogether *above* the law, man can never be, for the law is the expression of the Divine Essence itself.—M.]

[MILTON:—There are

"That bawl for freedom in their senseless mood,
And still revolt when truth would set them free;
License they mean when they cry liberty."—M.]

[SANDERSON:—Luther complains of "men who would be accounted good Christians merely because they rejected the authority of the Pope; who will do nothing that either the magistrate or God would have them to do; remaining in their old, disorderly nature, however much they may make their boast of the Gospel;" and who, as Calvin says, "reckoned it a great part of Christian liberty, that they might eat flesh on Fridays."—Better is it by voluntary abstinence to part with some of our liberty as to God's creatures, than by voluntary transgression to become the devil's captives.—M.]

[HOOKER:—It was not the meaning of our Lord and Saviour, in saying "Father, keep them in Thy name," that we should be careless in keeping ourselves. To our own safety our own sedulity is required.—M.]

[BARROW:—VER. 17. Human nature has become adorable as the true Shechinah, the everlasting palace of the Supreme Majesty, wherein the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily; the most holy shrine of the Divinity, the orb of inaccessible light, as this, and more than all this, if more could be expressed, or, if we could explain that text, "The word was made flesh and dwelt among us."—M.]

[SANDERSON:—When a piece of metal is coined with the king's stamp, and made current by his edict, no man may henceforth presume either to refuse it in payment, or to abate the value of it; so God, having stamped His own image upon every man, and, withal, signified His blessed pleasure, how precious He would have him to be in our eyes and esteem, by express edict proclaiming, "At the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man; I require every man to be his brother's keeper: for in the image of God made He man."—M.]

[*The brotherhood.*—Cf. Rom. xvi. 1; 3 Jno. 8. 9. When a Christian entered a foreign city, his first inquiry was for the Church (the brotherhood); and here he was received as a brother, and supplied with whatever could contribute to his spiritual or bodily refreshment. The Church letters, which were as *tesserae hospitales*, received the name of *γράμματα τετυπωμένα*, *epistolae firmatae*, because, to guard against counterfeits, they were drawn up after a certain form, *τύπος*; and also *γράμματα κοινωνικά*, *epistolae communicatoriae*, inasmuch as they indicated that the bearers were in the fellowship of the Church. *Euseb.* 4, 23; *Cyprian*, Ep. III.; *Neander* vol. I. § 2, p. 280.—*Sic honorandus rex, ut ne contra Deum peccemus.* CHRYSOSTOM.—M.]

CHAPTER II. 18–25.

ANALYSIS:—Exhortation of believing servants to self-denying obedience in doing and suffering after the example of Christ.

18 Servants,[1] *be* subject to *your* masters with[2] all fear; not only to the good and gen-
19 tle, but also to the froward.[3] For this *is* thankworthy,[4] if a man for conscience[5] to-
20 ward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory *is it*, if, when ye be
buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer
21 *for it*,[6] ye take it patiently, this *is* acceptable[7] with God. For even hereunto were ye
called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us[8] an example, that ye should
22 follow his steps: Who did no[9] sin, neither was guile found in his mouth:
23 Who, when he was reviled,[10] reviled not again; when he suffered,[11] he threatened
24 not; but committed *himself*[12] to him that judgeth righteously: Who his own self[13]
bare our sins in his own body on[14] the tree, that we,[15] being dead to sins, should live
25 unto righteousness: by whose stripes[16] ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going
astray;[17] but are[18] now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.

Verse 18. [δεσπόταις ὑμῶν Cod. Sin.—M.]
[1 Domestics, family servants. οἰκέτης not so harsh as δοῦλος. 'In all fear be subject to your masters,' Cod. Sin.—M.]
[2 ἐν—in, not with.—M.]
[3 σκολιός—עִקֵּשׁ Deut. xxxii. 5, crooked, perverse. These σκολίοι are "*salvi et intractabiles, duri ac morosi*," so Gerhard.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. ἐν παντ. φόβ. ὑπ.—M.]

Verse 19. [4 For this is grace, so German for χάρις, but χάρις not—*gratia divina* but—*laus*. Cf. Calvin, "*Idem valet nomen gratiæ quod laudis. Intelligit enim nullam gratiam vel laudem conciliari nobis coram Deo, si pœnam sustinemus quam nostris delictis simus promeriti: sed qui patienter ferunt injurias, eos laude dignos esse, et opus facere Deo acceptum.*"—M.]
[5 Consciousness, not conscience. The man knows that God is cognizant of his suffering, and acts rather with respect to God than to man. German: *Mitwissen*, not *Gewissen*, the former denoting cognizance in the sense of joint knowing, the latter, conscience. Render the whole verse, "For this is grace, if, on account of God's cognizance, any one endures tribulations (λύπας), suffering wrongfully.—M.]

Verse 20. [ποῖον—German 'was für ein,' or English, 'what kind of.'—M.]
[6 Cod. Sin. κολαζόμενοι ὑπομένετε. German, "suffer patiently." The participial construction of the Greek is, on the whole, preferable to English version. "For what kind of glory (is it) if doing wrong (sinning), and being buffeted, ye endure it patiently? but if well doing, and suffering (for it), ye endure (it) patiently, this is grace."—M.]
[7 χάρις, as above, "with God." The idea here, and in v. 19, seems to be that such conduct is the evidence of grace received, as none but a child of grace would thus act.—M.]

Verse 21. [8 Cod. Sin. reads ἀπέθανεν (died) for ἔπαθεν (suffered).—ἡμῶν ὑμῖν is the reading supported by the greatest number of MSS. Another reading, ἡμῶν ἡμῖν, according to Syr. Copt. Ephr. Aug., and still another, ὑμῶν ὑμῖν, Elzevir, Alford; on this last is based the German version, which renders "suffered for you, leaving you, etc."—M.]
[ὑπογραμμός—a copy-head,—a pattern, to write or paint by.—M.]

Verse 22. [9 ἐποίησεν, the Aorist, as distinguished from the Imperfect, ἐποιει, has the force of "never in a single instance." Alford.—M.]
[Cod. Sin. ηὑρέθη.—M.]

Verse 23. [The German retains the preferable participial form.—M.]
[10 11 Render thus: "Who being reviled, reviled not again, suffering, threatened not."—M.]
[12 παρεδίδου, either, "delivered (His enemies) up to (the Father)," so Alford, or, "delivered (His cause) up to (the Father"); in either case, as Alford suggests, perhaps not without reference to "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."—M.]
[Cod Sin. *ἐλοιδόρει.—M.]

Verse 24. [13 "Who Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree."—M.]

[14 The force of ἀνήνεγκεν is that "He took our sins to the tree, and offered them up on it." Alford. Cf. Vitringa in Huther: "*Vix uno verbo ἔμφασις vocis ἀναφέρειν exprimi potest. Nota* FERRE *et* OFFERRE. *Primo dicere voluit Petrus, Christum portasse peccata nostra, in quantum illa ipsi erant imposita. Secundo, ita tulisse peccata nostra, ut ea secum obtulerit in altari. Respicit ad animantes, quibus peccata primo imponebantur, quique deinceps peccatis onusti offerebantur. Sed in quam aram? ξύλον ait Petrus, lignum, h. e. crucem.*—M.]

[15 ἀπογενόμενοι—having died. The German renders, "that, having died to sins (*i. e.*, our own), we should live to the righteousness of Him by whose stripe ye are healed"; but this construction is untenable on textual grounds.—M.]

[16 Stripe, singular, is the right rendering of μώλωπι. μώλωψ. "*Paradoxon apostolicum: vibice sanati estis. Est autem μώλωψ vibex, frequens in corpore servili*, Sir. 12, 12." Bengel.—M.]

[Cod. Sin. *τῷ σωμ. without ἐν.—μώλωπ. without αὐτοῦ.—M.]

Verse 25. [17 Translate: "For ye were straying (ἦτε πλανώμενοι) like sheep."—M.]

[18 The German renders ἐπεστράφητε passively, "ye are brought back"; but the 2 Aor. Pass, ἐπεστράφην, is often found in a Middle sense, cf. Matt. ix. 22; x. 13; Mark v. 30,—translate, therefore, "but ye have returned."—M.]

[Cod. Sin. πλανώμενοι.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 18. **Domestics—but also to the crooked.**—*οἰκέται* less harsh and more comprehensive than *δοῦλοι*. Estius in Calov shrewdly suggests that the Apostle may have selected this designation because he was addressing Jewish Christians, to whom the term 'slave' was obnoxious, as incompatible with the people of God.

ὑποτασσόμενοι.—The most simple construction is to connect the Participle with the preceding Imperatives, especially with the *τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε*, to which the following *ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ* seems also to refer. It is the Apostle's way to intertwine his sentences after this manner: the following exhortations begin with similar participial sentences, ch. iii. 1. 7. 8. 9. We learn from it, that he considers the duties to which he exhorts included in the principal duty, v. 12. He particularizes the exhortation, v. 18, as to the manner how the fear of God should be evidenced, v. 17.

In all fear.—Primarily, holy awe of God, after v. 17. Cf. Col. iii. 22; Eph. vi. 5; with full, entire fear; but it also involves the dread of an earthly master. There are, as Cornelius observes, different kinds of fear: *a*, fear of punishment; *b*, fear of the guilt of offending God; *c*, fear of the offence of exciting masters to animosity against the faith.

ἀγαθοῖς good in themselves and kind to others. —*ἐπιεικής* indicates a particular exhibition of *ἀγαθός*=indulgent, yielding, kind like the Syrian captain, 2 Kings v. 13. 14.—*σκολιός*=עִקֵּשׁ, the contrary of the two other qualities, crooked in ways and therefore in heart, Ps. ci. 4; Prov. xi. 20; xvii. 20; iv. 24, similar to a piece of crooked wood that cannot be bent and is not fit for use, perverse, contentious, morose in disposition and behaviour. "Before such masters the false longings for liberty are most apt to break out: but here is just the point at which Christian views and principles appear in the strongest possible contrast with merely human and natural ones, and at which the peculiarity of the Christian calling, as a power of endurance, shows its marvellous glory." Wiesinger.

VER. 19. **For this is grace.**—The sense of these words is determined partly by the following *χάρις παρὰ Θεῷ*, partly by the antithesis *ποῖον γὰρ κλέος*. This question suggests that of our Lord, Lke. vi. 32. "For if you love them, which love you, what thanks have you?" *ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστί*; in Matt. it reads *τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε*. The ideas of thanks, reward and praise are here conjoined. Here as there the reference is to thanks, praise, or honour *before God*. You have no praise before God, you cannot glory in your tribulations (cf. Rom. v. 3), if you remain stedfast in troubles brought on by yourselves; but if, suffering wrongfully, you remain stedfast, you will have honour before God and secure His approval and good pleasure. Weiss compares the Hebrew מָצָא חֵן, =*εὑρίσκειν χάριν ἐναντίον θεοῦ*, Gen. vi. 8; xviii. 3; xxx. 27; cf. Lke. i. 30; ii. 52; Acts ii. 47. As to the sense it is therefore=*χαρίεν*, cf. 1 Tim. ii. 3; v. 4. Col. iii. 20. The following explanation of Steiger is neither clear nor suited to the context. "It is grace indeed, even in the sight of God, to be able to suffer for God's sake." If he means: "Grace effects and shows its power in this, or the power and blessing of grace are exhibited in this," *παρὰ Θεῷ* militates against his view.

For consciousness of God, etc.—*διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ*.—*συνείδησις*, the sharing of some knowledge, from *σύνοιδα*, I am conscious. Many take *Θεοῦ* as *Genit. obj.* on account of our knowledge of God, of His good will and pleasure; but it seems more natural to interpret: "because of the consciousness of God, because God knows all, because His eye sees all and because His arm punishes all evil," cf. Col. iii. 23. In this sense Joseph suffered innocently; he thought, "how then can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?" Gen. xxxix. 9. He suffered *διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ*.—To take *συνείδησις* here in the sense of conscience is forbidden by the addition of *Θεοῦ*, although it often has that meaning, Jno. viii. 9; Acts xxiii. 1; xxiv. 16; Rom. ii. 15; ix. 1; xiii. 5; 1 Cor. viii. 7. 10; x. 25. 28; 2 Cor. i. 12; iv. 2; 1 Tim. i. 5. 19; iii. 9; 2 Tim. i. 3; Tit. i. 15; Heb. ix. 14; x. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 16.—Weiss explains; "The consciousness of God, as that of Him who has ordained this subjection, should ever accompany and prompt us to the discharge of this duty. The idea *συνείδησις* is here too much narrowed and taken subjectively instead of objectively."

ὑποφέρει equivalent to the following *ὑπομένειν*= to endure with constancy, 2 Tim. iii. 11; 1 Cor. x. 13, to bear up under afflictions and to carry them cheerfully on one's shoulders.—*λύπαι*, events causing multiform grief.

VER. 20. **When ye be buffeted for your faults—suffer patiently.**—*ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε*.—The antithesis of *ἀδίκως πάσχειν*—*κολαφιζόμενοι*=to beat with the fist (*vulgo* "box the ear"), if as malefactors and punished, you suffer afflictions patiently. [*κολαφιζόμενοι*;

Bengel says: *pœna servorum, eaque subita.*—M.] The world may praise such conduct as courage and bravery, it will not give you glory before God.—Wrong: if the scourgings notwithstanding you persist in sinful courses; for the contrast is between merited suffering and martyr suffering. (Lachmann and Tischendorf read *ποῖον γὰρ*, but *γὰρ* is wanting in many MSS.).

VER. 21. **For even hereunto were ye called,**—namely, to do good and to endure with patience, ch. iii. 9, as we read, 1 Thess. iii. 3: "We are appointed, set thereunto," Acts xiv. 22. The first reason of the endurance of wrongful sufferings and perseverance in well-doing was the favour of God; the second is the calling of Christians as a further inducement to which is mentioned the example of Christ. The words are primarily addressed to slaves, as Bengel explains: this belongs to your Christian calling, which finds you in the condition of slaves; but they may be applied to all Christians, as is evident from the adduced motive.

Because also Christ suffered for you.—*καὶ Χριστὸς*, even Christ, the wholly Innocent One, has suffered. *καὶ* refers to *ἀδίκως πάσχων* [Alford makes *καὶ* apply to *ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* on the ground that the last two words carry with them the *ἀγαθοποιῶν*, as explained below, v. 24.—M.].—*ἔπαθεν*. Huss: "Peter does not say what Christ did suffer, his object being to intimate that Christ endured for us every kind of suffering. Herein then we are to imitate Him, viz.: in patiently carrying whatever is laid upon us." As the disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord, he may not refuse to endure such sufferings.

ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (Scholz and Tischendorf read *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*); *ὑπὲρ* may mean: in your stead, or for your benefit, or both. The last is probable, if reference be had not only to verses 22 and 23, but also to verse 24, cf. ch. iii. 18, where the vicarious character of the death of Jesus is unmistakably asserted. Winer remarks at p. 458 that *ὑπὲρ* sometimes touches closely upon *ἀντί*, because the agent, one acting for the benefit of another, in most instances becomes his substitute, cf. Gal. iii. 13; Rom. v. 7; xiv. 15; Matt. xx. 28; Jno. xv. 13; x. 15; vi. 51. The redemptive and typical nature of the sufferings of Christ are here intimately connected. Steiger justly asks: "What is it that makes the example of Christ obligatory to us, unless it be the fact that that typical suffering was at once and primarily a suffering for us, an offering of Christ and a benefit, engaging us to serve Him?"—This passage expresses in pregnant language the double idea: 1. You are obliged to obey Christ, because He suffered for you. 2. You are consequently called to innocent suffering, though you be guiltless, because also Christ, in suffering for you, suffered innocently and with the intent that in this respect you should imitate Him.

Leaving you—steps.—*ὑπολιμπάνω* another form of *ὑπολείπω*. Bengel remarks, "*in abitu ad Patrum.*"—*ὑπογραμμός*, 2 Macc. ii. 29, a pattern to write or draw by, a copy-head such as a writing-master would give to his pupils. This requires a steady hand and daily practice. Hence, pattern, copy, example. It is characteristic of this epistle, that it lays great stress on the pattern of Christ, cf. Jno. xiii. 15; Matt. xi. 29; xx. 28 with 1 Pet. iii. 18; iv. 1. 13.

ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς ἴχνεσιν.—*ἴχνη*, a footprint, also the heels of shoes. The figure of a copyhead passes into that of a guide, whose footprints travellers along a steep, narrow and slippery path must follow up step by step. The footprints of His readiness to suffer, of His gentleness and humility are particularly alluded to. *ἵνα* dependent on *ἔπαθεν*, not on *ἐκλήθητε*. The imitation and following of Christ consists especially in the daily taking up of the cross, Lke. ix. 23. [This passage is also imitated by Polycarp, c. 8: *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι ἐπι τὸ ξύλον, ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ · μιμηταὶ οὖν γενώμεθα τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ . . . . τοῦτον ἡμῖν τὸν ὑπογραμμὸν ἔθηκε δι' ἑαυτοῦ.*

Tertullian *de Patientia*, c. 3. "He Who is God, stooped to be born in the womb of His Mother, and waited patiently and grew up; and when grown up, was not impatient to be recognized as God. He was baptized by His servant, and repelled the tempter only by words. When He became a Teacher, He did *not strive nor cry, nor did any one hear His voice in the streets.* He did not *break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax.* He scorned no man's company; He shunned no man's table. He conversed with publicans and sinners. He poured out water and washed His disciples' feet. He would not injure the Samaritan village which did not receive Him, when His disciples called fire from heaven to consume it. He cured the unthankful; He withdrew from those who plotted against Him. He had the traitor constantly in His company and did not expose him. And when He is betrayed and is brought to execution, He is *like a sheep which before his shearers is dumb, and a lamb that doth not open its mouth.* He who, Lord of angelic Legions, did not approve the sword of Peter drawn in His defence, He is spit upon, scourged, mocked. Such long-suffering as His, is an example to all men, but is found in God alone."—M.]

VER. 22. **Who did no sin,** etc.—This description of the innocent and patient suffering of Jesus is almost a literal quotation from the Septuagint version of Is. liii. 9, the word *ἁμαρτίαν* alone being substituted for *ἀνομίαν*. The passages Is. l. 6; liii. 7, are more freely treated in v. 23. The servant of God there designated is therefore none other than the Messiah. His perfect sinlessness is even more explicitly affirmed in Heb. vii. 26; 2 Cor. v. 21.

εὑρίσκω not absolutely like *εἶναι*, but: no guile could be discovered in or proved from His words, all watching and sifting notwithstanding, and yet He was condemned. See Winer p. 701, cf. Jas. iii. 2. Bengel notices the fitness of this exhortation to slaves, who were greatly liable to the temptation of deceiving, slandering and menacing their fellow-slaves.

VER. 23. **Who being reviled—threatened not.**—He fulfilled Prov. xx. 22; xxiv. 29; He did what David had done, 2 Sam. xvi. 10, etc. The strong and bitter words, which Jesus had sometimes to use, Matt. vii. 5; xvi. 3; xxii. 18; xxiii. 13. 33; xii. 34, were not the utterings of personal hatred, nor retorts of insults heaped up-

on Him, but necessary evidences of the truth in order to cast a sting into the heart of His adversaries, and if possible to save them.

But delivered—righteously.—The second part of the sentence contains a climax. He even abstained from threatening, while He saw into the impending judgments. *παραδίδου δὲ*, He committed His cause to God, not however by invoking the vengeance of God on His enemies, but by praying for their conversion and pardon. If they persisted in repelling the overtures of grace, He left him to the justice of God. In this sense He said: "I seek not mine own glory: there is One that seeketh and judgeth." Jno. viii. 50.—Jeremiah spoke differently in the spirit of the Old Testament: "Let me see Thy vengeance upon them, for unto Thee have I revealed my cause." Jer. xi. 20.

To Him that judgeth righteously, otherwise than the anger of the injured part, and the violence of ungodly enemies would make it. It is both a great consolation and an invitation to leave vengeance to Him, cf. Rom. xii. 19; ii. 6–11; 1 Pet. iii. 9; 2 Thess. i. 6; Lke. xviii. 7. 8; ix. 55. Lechler remarks, that the Apostle's language was giving one the impression of coming in contact with an eye-witness of the arrest, of the trial, of the rough ill treatment and even of the crucifixion of the Lord. [Calvin has the following: "*Qui sibi ad expetendam vindictam indulgent, non judiciis officium Deo concedunt, sed quodam modo facere volunt suum carnificem.*—M.]

Ver. 24. **Who Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree.**—This verse is connected with *ὑπερ ὑμῶν* of v. 21, and defines it more particularly; it also brings the antithesis to v. 22 to a climax. Not only had He no sin, or did not sin Himself, but He bore our sins, etc.—*ἀνήνεγκεν.* The exegesis is determined by Is. liii. which evidently was before the Apostle's mind.

In that chapter occur the words נָשָׂא, סָבַל, *φέρειν.* The LXX. render: *τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν*; in v. 12, *καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν*; in v. 10, "When His soul shall make an offering for sin." All exegetical attempts to explain away the idea of substitution and the system of sacrifice closely connected with it, are altogether futile. As in the Old Testament, the expressions, "to carry one's sin," or, "to bear one's iniquity," are equivalent to "suffer the punishment and guilt of one's sin," Lev. xx. 17. 19; xxiv. 15; Ezek. xxiii. 35, so "to carry another's sin," denotes "to suffer the punishment and guilt of another," or "to suffer vicariously," Lev. iii. 19. 17; Numb. xiv. 33; Lam. v. 7; Ezek. xviii. 19. 20. Can this be done in any other way than by the imputation of the guilt and sin of others, as was the case in the sin and guilt-offerings? Weiss is quite arbitrary in persisting to exclude the idea of sacrifice from Is. liii., for v. 10 clearly refers to it. From a Jewish point of view such a separation of the doctrine of substitution from the idea of sacrifice is simply impossible, cf. Jno. i. 29; Lev. xvi. 21. 22.—The juxtaposition of *ἡμῶν* and *αὐτός* both here and in Is. liii. is not insignificant, but gives prominence to the idea of substitution. Calvin says: "As under the law the sinner, in order to become free from sin, offered a sacrifice in his stead, so Christ took upon Himself the curse which we have merited by our sins in order to expiate it before God." Calov. "The cross of Christ was the lofty altar to which, when He was about to offer Himself, He ascended laden with our sins."

ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον=to carry up to the tree of the cross and thus to carry away and blot out, cf. Jas. ii. 21; Heb. ix. 28. The expression "tree" for "cross" is by no means undesigned, but selected as in Acts v. 30; x. 39, with reference to Deut. xxi. 23, cf. Gal. iii. 13, where it is said of him that is hanged on a tree, "he is accursed of God."

τὰς ἁμαρτίας not sin-offerings or offerings for our sins, a rendering which is inadmissible on grammatical grounds, but the guilt and punishment of our sins;—these He took upon Himself and expiated them, cf. Col. ii. 14; Gal. iii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 21.

In His own body, cf. Eph. ii. 15. This expression is far from singular in connection with the fact that Christ bore the punishment of sin also in His holy soul, provided we start from the idea of sacrifice and assume that Peter was comparing the body of Christ with the body of the slain victim. Gerhard says: "The body is mentioned in particular, because it was visibly suspended from the cross, and because His bodily sufferings were more immediately perceptible by the senses." Weiss tries to find a reference to the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper—but this seems to be rather far-fetched. How this carrying of the punishment of man's sin—which goes far beyond a compassionating entering into the feelings of our sinful misery—was possible must ever remain a wonderful mystery, on which the Petrine and Johannean doctrine of Christ as the real and original Head of mankind, sheds only a feeble light.

That having died to sins, we should live to the righteousness of Him.—Calov. "Peter combines the two benefits of the death of Christ, 1st, by it our sins are expiated, and 2d, in virtue of it sin is killed in us. We add, that the combination gives prominence to holiness as the end and aim of the atonement.

ἀπογίνομαι=*ἀποθνήσκω*, cf. Rom. vi. 2. Bengel remarks: "*γενέσθαι τινὸς* means to become somebody's slave, *ἀπό* denotes removal. The body of Christ was removed, taken away from that tree, up to which He had carried our sins; thus we should remove ourselves from sin, become free from it." This explanation is more acute than satisfactory. The negative, dying unto sin, must go hand in hand with the positive. The connection of holiness and renovation with the death of Jesus is not indicated here, but may be supplied by recollecting that the gift of the Holy Ghost and the power of faith were acquired by the death of Jesus. Thereby the vital strength of sin is broken and the desire of righteousness planted in the soul.—*ζῆν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ*=to live in the service of righteousness, in keeping the commandments of God and Christ instead of the former service of sin. Bengel: "The whole of righteousness is one, sin manifold."

By whose stripe ye were healed.—*Μώλωψ*, a wound like that inflicted on slaves by scourging, a stripe or rather the weal left by a stripe. The

Singular is used here as in Is. liii.; the sacred body of Jesus was so tortured that it was, as it were, only one wound or stripe.—οὐ τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ. (Lachmann and Griesbach omit αὐτοῦ; Tischendorf retains it as the more difficult reading in his last edition). More emphatic than the relative by itself; supply τούτου before it.—Ἰάθητε. The apostle passes from the first person to the second, resuming his direct address to Christian slaves. So also at v. 25; the whole section from v. 18–25 is addressed to them. μώλωψ and ἰᾶσθαι suggest the secondary thought: You have to endure no kind of sufferings and wounds, but Christ, your Lord, endured them also; your Master exacts not more from you than He has borne Himself; He bears all in your stead in order to save you; how much more ought you, who are sinful, quietly and patiently to endure suffering?—But how shall we solve the prophetical and apostolical paradox, that Christ's stripe is our healing? Healing is here primarily not to be understood as a sinner's entire restoration to the image of God, else the preceding exhortation would not have been necessary, but as designating the healing of the stings of conscience, caused by sin; but this involves of course the principle that entire healing is rendered possible. "Sins, committed against our conscience, hurt the soul and leave scars which ever and anon open afresh, sting the conscience and hurt the soul." Steinhofer.—These wounds of your soul were healed when by faith in the atoning death of Jesus you received forgiveness. He suffered the smiters to draw long furrows on His back, Ps. cxxix. 8, to wound His head and face, His hands and feet, and to pierce His heart that in our stead, as the Head for the members, He might make atonement."—

"Thou didst suffer stripe and weal,
Treatment full of shame and pain,
That my plague thou mightest heal,
And my peace forever gain."

[German Hymn,—

Du hast lassen Wunden schlagen,
Dich erbärmlich richten zu,
Um zu heilen meine Plagen,
Um zu setzen mich in Ruh!—M.]

Tauler:—"He had to die that we might live: He was afflicted that we might rejoice; He was wounded that we might be healed: He shed His blood that we might be cleansed: the blood of the Physician was shed and made the patient's remedy."

VER. 25. **For ye were straying like sheep.**—The Apostle adds how and from what state they came to this healing. For ye were straying like sheep. A sheep is a stupid animal: so is the sinner, repelling salvation and straying in the ways of corruption. Sheep, as Aristotle observes, are subject to as many diseases as man. Stray sheep, separated from the shepherd and the flock, lack food and care, are exposed to many dangers, may become a prey to the wolf or fall into some abyss. The expression is taken from Is. liii., and the figure is of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, Numb. xxvii. 17; 1 Kings xxii. 17; Ps. cxix. 176; Ezek. xxxiv. 5. 11, and in the New, Luke xv. 4, etc.; Jno. x. 15 etc.; Matt. ix. 36. It may have been particularly appropriate to the case of slaves of the dispersion who often changed masters and their place of domicile. Straying and sickness are often conjoined. "The figure of stray sheep alludes to original union with God and represents straying as alienation from God in consequence of sin." Jno. x. 12. Wiesinger.

But ye are now brought back (from the wilderness of sin, error and death) **to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.**—ἐπεστράφητε, ye have been converted and have suffered yourselves to be converted. By faith you have laid hold of the atonement made for all and have returned from your wanderings. Christ is the arch-Shepherd, the true, the good Shepherd, promised already in the Old Testament, Is. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 23; xxxvii. 24; Ps. xxiii. 1; cf. Jno. x. 11; Heb. xiii. 20; 1 Pet. v. 4. He even gives His life for the sheep, Jno. x. 12. The Apostle turns to that side of the pastoral relation of Christ which exhibits Him as the Bishop and Guardian of souls.—ἐπίσκοπος is used of God in the LXX. version of Job xx. 29; the phrase is however more probably taken from Ezek. xxxiv. 11. 12, where we read: "For thus saith the Lord God, Behold I, *even* I, will both search my sheep and seek them out (ἐπισκέψομαι). As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep *that are* scattered, so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day." He is ever careful of the salvation of His sheep and seeks to protect them from destruction. He is the Shepherd and Guardian of souls.—ψυχῶν not without special significance as it relates to slaves, and servants who are so often treated, as if they had no immortal soul, and who may therefore so much the more readily forget that they have a soul which they may lose, and that with the soul lost, all else is lost.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Divine origin of Christianity may also be demonstrated by the fact that it enters into and hallows every relation of life and descends to the most degraded of men and to the lowest conditions of society.

2. The glory of the Christian vocation is peculiarly manifested by endurance of wrong and indefatigable well-doing under it.

3. Plato anticipated the ideal of such a righteous man in the following passage of his second book on the State: "Without doing any wrong, he must have the greatest appearance of unrighteousness in order to be thoroughly approved in righteousness, since even slander and its consequences cannot move him, and although all his life-long considered unrighteous, he is yet righteous. The righteous, thus minded will be bound, scourged, tortured, blinded in both eyes and finally, having endured every possible evil, he will be hung." Plato's ideal and conception find their strongest fulfilment and reality in Christianity.

4. The exhortation that we should copy in ourselves, the pattern which Christ has left us in His life and death is enclosed forwards and backwards, ver. 21 and v. 24, by the recollection that He was crucified for us. This is the impelling motive which at once enables us to imitate Christ and to do it cheerfully.

5. The vicarious sacrificial death of Jesus, based on Is. liii., is here affirmed with so much clearness that even rationalistic adversaries are unable to resist it, cf. Wegschneider, *Instit.* p. 407. 6th ed. How we are healed by the wounds of Jesus, is a mystery which reason cannot fully solve, and to which we have to submit by faith in the clear testimony of Holy Writ. "Jesus, who by His blood has effected our reconciliation, is Himself the Physician who heals our souls." Even Dr. Baur is constrained to admit that the idea of substitution cannot be denied in such passages of the New Testament as Rom. iv. 25; Gal. i. 4; Rom. viii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 19, that the preposition ὑπέρ denotes both the idea of substitution and what takes place for the benefit of man; that these two points are passing the one into the other, so as to interpenetrate each other, but that the latter is decidedly predominant; that according to the Apostle's doctrine the justice of God had to be satisfied by an actual atonement for the punishment of sin; that viewing the death of Jesus from the stand-point of Divine justice, is only the outer side of the event and its merely judicial aspect, but that the inmost ground of the Divinely-made institution is the grace of God, Rom. iii. 24, 2 Cor. v. 19, and a point so much more extensive than the other as to constrain us to regard only as an emanation of Divine *grace* whatever Divine *justice* may claim of the death of Jesus; that it was grace that God would not allow men to be punished in their own persons, but in their substitute. See Baur, *Lehrbegriff des Ap. Paulus* p. 541. This is certainly a wonderful testimony from the lips of an unbeliever.

6. The medicine has been prepared by His wounds, the balsam has been cleared under the press of the cross.—"The blood of Jesus is the most precious balsam with which Jesus washes and heals our wounds, as the good Samaritan poured oil and wine in the wounds of the bleeding and half-dead man to lessen their smart and to heal them. There is vital strength in this crimson oil whereby we are fully healed." Steinhofer, *Evang. Glaubensgrund*, p. 434.

7. Observe the important distinction between the atonement as the objective act of God in Christ in virtue of which salvation has been acquired for and is offered to sinners, and the subjective appropriation of salvation by means of conversion. The words of Paul: "Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God," 1 Cor. vi. 11, apply only to those who have sought Christ in penitence and faith and laid hold of His merits.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

How may the much-lamented difficulties relating to domestics be remedied? 1. By the return of the fear of God into the houses and hearts of men; 2. By masters and servants entering upon the imitation of Christ.—The secret of partaking more and more of the grace of God.—The Christian call, 1. To a state of grace, in order to be and live in it; 2. To suffer innocently and patiently; 3. To persevere in well-doing. — The Christian's consolation in innocent suffering.—Righteousness of life must flow from righteousness by faith.—The sufferings of Christ *for* us and *before* us.—The power of Christ's example. —The great change in conversion.—Man a stray sheep, while excluded from the calling of God in Christ.

STARKE:—God ordains, that one should rule and another serve.—Bad masters are for the trial and perhaps also for the chastisement of servants. —Masters are often decried as whimsical for desiring propriety and right in things spiritual and temporal. Servants, be ashamed and do not slander your godly masters, but learn to be wise and to do all things right after the will of God and their mind —Many masters may deal ill with their people, but if they endure wrong patiently, attend to their service in the fear of God, pray diligently for their masters, they are God's people and God will be their helper and reward, Gen. xxxi. 12.—As it is the shame of servants to be punished for ill-doing, so it is their veritable honour and glory before God and man if they endure wrong innocently and patiently, ch. iv. 15. 16.—Christians are not called to voluptuousness and good days but to the cross, ch. ii. 21.—We should often look at ourselves in the sufferings of Christ, as if they were a mirror, that we may be glorified into the same image, Heb. xii. 3.—Christ is our Gift and Pattern, our Mediator and Head, our Shepherd and Light. What is our duty? To believe and to obey (follow) Jno. viii. 12.—The words, the ways and the works of Christ are, as it were, living letters and footprints for us to copy and follow, Heb. xii. 6.—If you have a just cause and yet are oppressed, be still and persevere, God will maintain your cause, Ps. xciv. 15.—Away with foolish sacrifices for the living or the dead! The one sacrifice of our High-priest Jesus Christ on the cross is sufficient for the reconciliation of the whole world, Heb. ix. 12. 26; x. 11. 12.—The exaltation and glory of Christians blossom forth from the cross.—Sin was sacrificed and slain by Christ that it should also be dead in us. Where it lives, the virtue of the death of Christ is as yet unfelt, Rom. vi. 6.—Sin is like a maze: whoso enters the same cannot easily find his way out.—Whoso remains in the wilderness out of Christ (*extra*) must at last fall into the abyss of hell and eternally despair, Acts iv. 12; Ps. cxix. 176.

AUGUSTINE:—"We must not cease to hope for the wicked, but rather pray for them the more diligently, that they may become good, because the number of saints has at all times been increased by the number of the ungodly. Those who are goats to-day, may be sheep to-morrow, those who are weeds to-day, to-morrow may be wheat."

KAPFF:—What is necessary in conversion? 1. That we should be healed by the wounds of Jesus. 2. That we should die to sin and live to righteousness.

[LEIGHTON:—VER. 18. It is a thing of much concernment, the right ordering of families; for all other societies, civil and religious are made up of these. Villages and cities and churches and commonwealths and kingdoms, are but a collection of families: and therefore such as these are, for the most part, such must the whole societies predominantly be. One particular house is but a very small part of a kingdom, yet the wickedness

and lewdness of that house, be it but the meanest in it, as of servants one or more; and though it seem but a small thing, yet goes in to make up that heap of sin that provokes the wrath of God and draws on public calamity.—Servants. 1. Their duty (be subject); 2. Its extent (to the froward); 3. Its principle (for conscience toward God).—The eagle may fly high and yet have its eye down upon some carrion on earth; even so a man may be standing on the earth and on some low part of it, and yet have his eye upon heaven and be contemplating it. That which one man cannot at all see in another, is the very thing that is most considerable in their action, namely, the *principle* whence they flow and the *end* to which they tend. This is the form and life of actions, that by which they are earthly or heavenly. Whatsoever be the matter of them, the spiritual mind hath that alchymy indeed, of burning base metals unto gold, earthly employments into heavenly.—V. 21. The particular things that Christians are here said to be called to, are *suffering*, as their lot, and *patience*, as their duty, even under the most unjust and undeserved sufferings.—He that aims high, shoots the higher for it, though he shoot not so high as he aims. This is that which ennobles the spirit of a Christian, the propounding of this our high pattern, the example of Jesus Christ.—V. 24. The eye of a godly man is not fixed on the false sparkling of the world's pomp, honour and wealth. It is dead to them, being quite dazzled with a greater beauty. The grass looks fine in the morning, when it is set with those liquid pearls, the drops of dew that shine upon it; but if you can look but a little while on the body of the sun, and then look down again, the eye is as it were dead; it is not that faint shining on the earth that it thought so gay before: and as the eye is blinded and dies to it, so within a few hours that gayety quite vanishes and dies itself. —Faith looks so steadfastly on its suffering Saviour, that, as they say (*Intellectus fit illud quod intelligit*), it makes the soul like Him, assimilates and conforms it to His death, as the Apostle speaks. That which Papists fabulously say of some of their saints, that they received the impression of the wounds of Christ in their body, is true in a spiritual sense of the soul of every one that is indeed a saint and a believer; it takes the very print of His death by beholding Him and *dies to sin*, and then takes that of His rising again, and *lives to righteousness;* as it applies it to *justify*, so to *mortify*, drawing virtue from it. Thus said one, "Christ aimed at this in all those sufferings that with so much love He went through; and shall I disappoint Him and not serve His end?"—M.]

[On the duties of Christian servants see Bp. Fleetwood's "Sermons on relative duties."—M.]

[Jortin:—Ver. 18. "The law of nature knows no such thing as slavery, for by nature all men are free and equal; but by the civil laws, and by the practice of nations, it was established, and still continues among those who know not the Gospel; and the more is the shame and the pity, it is to be found in some places where Christianity is professed. The religion of Christ, when it first made its progress in the world, left the civil laws of nations, in a great measure, as it found them, lest by altering or repealing them, it should bring confusion and disturbance into human society; but, as by its own genius and tendency, it leads men gently back to the precepts of nature and equity, to kindness and to mercy, it put an end by degrees, in most civilized nations, to that excessive distance and difference between masters and slaves, which owed its origin to outrage and war, to violence and calamity; so that in Christian countries the service which is performed is usually, as it ought to be, voluntary and by agreement. But what the writers of the New Testament have said concerning slaves, holds true concerning hired servants and all those who are employed in other denominations under a master, that they discharge their office modestly, diligently and willingly, and act with faithfulness and integrity in every thing that is committed to them."—M.]

[Macknight:—"In this verse the Apostle establishes one of the most noble and important principles of morality, namely, that our obligation to relative duties does not depend, either on the character of the persons to whom they are to be performed, or on their performance of the duties which they owe to us, but on the unalterable relations of things established by God."—M.]

[Bp. Horne:—Ver. 21. "Our Lord was 'both a sacrifice for sin, and also an example of godly life.' (Collect for second Sunday after Easter.) By His sacrifice He procured us grace to follow His example, which otherwise would have been proposed to us in vain; by His example He showed us how to make a right use of that grace, which, unless we do, it is given in vain. So that if he who regards Him as an example, and not as a Redeemer, will be lost, because he cannot follow Him; he who takes Him for a Redeemer, and not for an example, will be lost, because he does not follow Him, since redemption was in order to holiness; and although it be most certain that without Christ no man can attain unto holiness, yet it is no less certain that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." He only is fully and effectually redeemed, and has evidence to assure him of it, who bears stamped on his soul the image and superscription of his Saviour." —M.]

[Dean Stanhope:—Vv. 24. 25. "A consideration of the purpose for which our Saviour suffered should be a matter of great consolation to us, when we meditate upon His sufferings, and cause us to mingle tears of joy with those of grief. The latter we should be insensible not to pay to the excruciating agonies of our beloved Master; the former we should be unthankful and cruel to ourselves not to give to the happy effects of the misery which He so graciously condescended to undergo for us. But, to make both effectual, let us, inflamed with zeal and gratitude and love unfeigned, endeavour for our own particular, and most devoutly beg for the rest, as the best of Churches teaches us, that the innumerable benefits of this precious blood-shedding may have their full extent and free course; that "we and the whole Church of Christ may receive remission of sins" and all the other blessed effects of His passion; that He, who "hath made a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," would cause His way to be known, and show His

saving health to the yet dark and unbelieving nations; and that all, who do already know it, may walk worthy of their knowledge and of the high vocation wherewith they are called. And O! that the death tasted by our Redeemer for every man may be effectual to the saving of every man! Even so, blessed Jesus, "by thine agony and bloody sweat, by thy cross and passion, good Lord, deliver us."—M.]

CHAPTER III. 1–7.

ANALYSIS:—Exhortations addressed to married people, enjoining duties affecting their mutual relations, from a Christian point of view.

1 Likewise, ye wives,[1] *be* in subjection to your own husbands; that, if[2] any obey not
the word,[3] they also may without the word[4] be won by the conversation of the wives;
2, 3 While they behold[5] your chaste conversation *coupled* with fear.[6] Whose[7] adorning,
let it not be that outward *adorning* of plaiting the hair,[8] and of wearing of gold,[9] or
4 of putting on of apparel; But *let it be* the hidden man of the heart, in that which
is not corruptible,[10] *even the ornament* of a meek and quiet spirit,[11] which is in the
5 sight of God of great price. For after this manner in the old time[12] the holy
women also, who trusted[13] in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their
6 own husbands: Even[14] as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters
7 ye are,[15] as long as[16] ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement.[17] [18]Likewise,
ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife,
as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your
prayers be not hindered.

Verse 1. [1 Cod., A. B. and Sinait. omit αἱ. ὁμοίως goes back to ch. ii. 13.—M.]
[2 καὶ εἰ, even if; the force of καὶ εἰ is, "put the worst case, even if your husbands are positively disobedient to the word, your duty is clear."—M.]
[3 κερδηθήσονται; another reading is κερδηθήσωνται. Rec. Cod. Sin.—On ἵνα with a Fut. Indic. see Winer, 6th ed. p. 258, and cf. Rev. xxii. 14; translate "that they shall be won."—M.]
[4 ἄνευ λόγου, without word. Translate the whole verse: "Likewise, wives, be in subjection to your own husbands, that even if any obey not the word, they shall be won without word by means of the conversation of the wives."—M.]

Verse 2. [5 ἐποπτεύσαντες—having beheld, when they behold.—M.]
[6 The German renders "your conversation chaste in fear."—M.]

Verse 3. [7 ὧν—of whom, *i. e.*, *your* adornment.—M.]
[8 ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν—braiding of hair, cf. 1 Tim. ii. 9.—M.]
[9 περιθέσεως—putting round (the head, the arm, the ankle or the finger). Translate the verse: "Your adornment let it be not the outward of braiding of hair, and putting round golden *ornaments*, or of putting on of dresses."—M.]

Verse 4. [10 ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ—in the incorruptible *ornament* of.—M.]
[11 τοῦ πρᾳέος καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος—the meek and quiet spirit, which, etc.—M.]

Verse 5. [12 ποτὲ καὶ—formerly also.—M.]
[13 ἐλπίζουσαι (Part. of Imperfect, according to Winer, 6th ed., p. 305)—who hoped.—M.]

Verse 6. [14 No necessity for "even"; the Greek has simply ὡς.—M.]
[15 ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα—of whom ye have become children.—M.]
[16 ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι states the condition on which they have become Sarah's children; render, therefore, "if," instead of "as long as."—M.]
[17 καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν—and are not afraid of any sudden fear. πτόησιν—fear from without, some external cause of terror. See additional observations under "Exegetical and Critical."—M.]

Verse 7. [18 This verse needs entire recasting; the E. V. is involved. We translate, closely following the original: "Ye husbands, in like manner, (refers to πάντας τιμήσατε, ch. ii. 17) dwelling, according to knowledge with the feminine, as with the weaker vessel, giving honour as to those who are also fellow-inheritors of the grace of life, in order that your prayers be not hindered. So Alford. The Cod. Sin. reads συνομιλοῦντες, "companying with," for συνοικοῦντες, and supplies ποικίλης, manifold before χάριτος.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1. **Likewise, wives, be in subjection to your own husbands.**—The Apostle now passes on to conjugal duty, intending to make ὁμοίως convey the idea that the obedience of wives to their husbands is as sacred an obligation as that of servants to their masters. What may be the reason of his not noticing the duties of believing masters to their servants, to which Paul, in Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25, has special reference? It is probably to be found in the circumstance that in the Churches to which he wrote this Epistle were only few believing masters, or none that had slaves. Estius sees in this circumstance an additional reason that this Epistle was addressed to the *Jews* of the dispersion, among whom were many slaves, but few masters. —*αἱ γυναῖκες*, address as in ch. ii. 18; iii. 7; Eph. v. 22. 25.—*ὑποτασσόμεναι*, Participle, as ch. ii. 18, governed by the principle, ch. ii. 17, "Fear God," etc., cf. Col. iii. 18; Gen. iii. 16.

To your own husbands.—Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 35; vii. 2; Eph. v. 21. 25. 28. 33. *ἴδιος* is not without emphasis; it adverts to an antithesis; it is to remind the wives, as Calvin rightly observes, of the duty of chastity, and warn them of all suspicious obedience to strange men. Believing wives married to unbelieving or pagan husbands might, even apart from the then prevalent demoralization of the conjugal estate, be tempted to seek close intercourse with enlightened men, strong in faith, and to be led by them; such a course might easily shake the confidence of the conjugal relation; hence the Apostle's delicate caution. The Apostle takes it for granted that the greater number of husbands of believing wives are also believers in the publicly preached word; but even if (*καὶ εἰ*) this should not be the case, the wives must persevere in self-sacrificing, self-denying obedience, and thus seek to win their husbands, not by talking and arguing, but by the powerful preaching of a quiet conversation.—*ἄνευ λόγου*, without open preaching and peculiar arts of speech on the part of the wives. —*διὰ τῆς ἀναστροφῆς*, by means of their behaviour and obedience; this is their principal task.—*κερδηθήσωνται*, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 19–22; vii. 17. To gain for Christ, for the Gospel, for the kingdom of heaven, for themselves=*σώζειν*. Calov remarks that the expression alludes to the great value of the soul, and to the holy joy in their conversion. The greatest gain is that of the converted themselves, Phil. iii. 8. [Leighton observes: "A soul converted is gained to itself, gained to the pastor, or friend, or wife, or husband who sought it, and gained to Jesus Christ: added to His treasury, who thought not His own precious blood too dear to lay out for this gain." —M.]—Grotius cites the language of the heathen orator Libanius, which shows how primitive Christian wives followed these exhortations. He exclaims: "What wives have these Christians!"

Ver. 2. **When they behold your conversation, chaste in fear.**—*ἐποπτεύσαντες*, cf. ch. ii. 12, an insight flowing from close observation. —*τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνήν*.—The allusion is probably (with reference to ch. ii. 17) to the fear of God, not to the fear of the husband, as in Eph. v. 33. —*ἁγνήν* not=chaste in its restricted sense, but because of its close connection with *φόβῳ* and with the sequel, denotes chaste in a wider sense, =pure, holy, cf. Jas. iii. 17.—So Calov, not only with reference to conjugal fidelity and cleanness of the body.

Ver. 3. **Your adornment let it not be the outward** (adornment) **of braiding the hair, and putting round golden ornaments, or of putting on of dresses.**—This verse is closely connected with the foregoing. This holy conversation in the fear of God is described first negatively: "In contrast with the means used by wordly-minded women to attach their husbands, the Apostle specifies the means whereby a Christian wife may hope to win even a resisting husband."—*ὧν ἔστω* sc. *ὁ κόσμος*, cf. 1 Tim. ii. 9.— The Genitives are those of nearer definition, and describe the act of adorning, not the objects of adornment.—*ἐμπλοκή*, the artificial braiding of hair; female vanity is inexhaustible in the invention of new styles and fashions. Calov cites a passage from Jerome's Epistle to Demetrius, in which he adverts to this subject, and quotes Cyprian's sharp censure of women on this score. The views, which even the more serious heathen held concerning such trifles, have been collected by Steiger from Plato, Sophocles and Plutarch. —*ἡ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων*.—Peter, of course, adverts simply to the *costliness* of dresses. [But does not *ἐνδύσεως* allude rather to putting them on in an unbecoming and *indecent* manner? Alford says that 'within the limits of propriety and decorum, the common usage is the rule.' True, but where are those limits? Are they observed in the 'full dress' of the best society of either hemisphere? Is 'full dress' not a misnomer, and ought not our Christian matrons to use their influence in having full dress made more *dress?*—M.] Calov:— "Peter forbids not any and every adornment, but a modest and seemly adorning of the body, conformably to their several stations, is allowed," cf. 1 Cor. xii. 23.

Ver. 4. **But** let it be **the hidden man of the heart—price.**—*κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος* = *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος*, Rom. vii. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16. This hidden man is not, as Steiger holds, = *καρδία*, but that which the Spirit of God forms and develops in the secret workshop of the heart, namely, the new way of thinking, feeling and willing, the new spiritual life, the new nature, the inmost kernel of man's religion, in as far as he has within him something flowing from the life of Jesus. [In other words the inner man is the Christian, the regenerated, daily-renewed man, adorned with the beauty of holiness with his (heart) affections centred in God.—M.].—*ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ*. Contrasted with those perishable, worthless trifles, v. 3. A neuter adjective is used for an abstract noun (v. Winer, p. 266). Beza: = *sinceritas, incorruptio*. *πραΰς* = עָנִי mild, gentle, meek, Matt. xxi. 5; 1 Cor. xiii. 4, etc.; Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12; Mtt. xi. 29; Jas. i. 20; iii. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 21; Gal. vi. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 24. The contrary of self-will, pride, presumption, obstinacy, hardness, anger and envy.—*ἡσυχίου*, calm, tranquil, without passionate excitement. Bengel:—*mansuetus, qui non turbat, tranquillus, qui turbas aliorum placide fert.*— *πνεύματος* relates not to the Holy Spirit, but to the spiritual life, infused into believers by the Holy Ghost.—*ὅ ἐστιν* may be connected either with *πνεύματος* or with *ἀφθάρτῳ*. *Bengel* connects it with the latter, as being the principal subject. [but "the meek and quiet spirit" seems to be the main thing desired.—M.].—*πολυτελής* = *πολύτιμος* ch. i. 19.—[cf. Mk. xiv. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 9; Pro. i. 18.—M.].—*ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, "*coram Deo, qui interna, non externa, spectat, cui placere curant pii.*" Bengel.

Ver. 5. **For after this manner formerly also the holy women, who hoped in God, adorned themselves,** etc.—*οὕτω* refers to what immediately precedes. The proof of it [the meek and quiet spirit.—M.] is their obedience.—*ἅγιαι γυναῖκες*, Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21; Eph. iii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 21; those women of blessed memory and singled out in the history of salvation; their personality is defined by their hope in God. If God is all in all in a man's heart, it has renounced the idol 'vanity' and expelled passionate excitement, cf. 1 Tim. v. 5. Tertullian:—"Be clothed with the silk of honesty, the byssus of holiness

and the purple of chastity: thus adorned, God will be your friend." Bengel:—"*vera sanctitas, spes in Deum: est hoc epitheton pars subjecti.*"

Ver. 6. **As Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord.**—This obedience is illustrated by the example of Sarah, whom the Rabbis also were wont to set up as a pattern. She showed her obedience first in leaving with her husband the land of her nativity in reliance upon the promises of God, secondly in regarding Abraham as her Lord and calling him so, Gen. xviii. 12, notwithstanding they were both descended from a common earthly parent, Gen. xx. 12.—*ὑπήκουεν* denotes the continuance of her obedience, which was rewarded by Abraham in his turn obeying her, Gen. xvi. 2; xxi. 12.—Grotius remarks that when the corruption of morals had become general at Rome, wives were called mistresses [of course in a good sense.—M.]

Of whom ye have become children.—*ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα.* This is one of the Apostle's frequent allusions to Isaiah; cf. ch. li. 1. 2. "Look upon the rock whence ye are hewn (Abraham) and to the hole of the pit (or well) whence ye are digged (Sarah)." Sarah is here mentioned as the first mother of the people of Israel.—It is not *ἐστὲ* but *ἐγενήθητε*, because the expression 'children of Sarah' has not only a carnal but also a spiritual import. Steiger argues from this passage that the Apostle was addressing Gentile Christians as he would hardly have said to Jewesses, "ye have become Sarah's children" without adding some such explanation as this; "You have now become Sarah's children *indeed* or after a *spiritual manner;*" but the opposite conclusion seems more in place. Did our Lord make such a qualification when He said to Zaccheus, the Jewish publican-in-chief, "He also is a son of Abraham"? Luke xix. 9. Did He do it in the case of the infirm woman of whom He said that she was a daughter of Abraham? Lke. xiii. 16; Jno. viii. 39. Even John the Baptist destroyed the delusion that those are Abraham's children who are descended from him after the flesh, Matt. iii. 9. Believing Jewesses would have no difficulty in understanding what was meant; while to Christian Gentile women it would hardly have been equally intelligible and applicable. Weiss remarks, "To be called the daughters of Sarah was no particular distinction conferred upon Gentile women, but to be designated as the children of their venerated ancestress and that in the highest sense (*i. e.*, of similarity of disposition), was the loftiest praise bestowed upon Jewesses." This conclusion is corroborated by the quotation from Is. li.

If ye do good and are not afraid of any sudden fear.—*ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι*, not *in that* - - - - or *because* - - - -, or *if* - - - -, but: *as those who* - - - - [so German.—M.]. You evidence your relationship to Sarah by doing good. Grotius recalls the amiable reception which Sarah accorded to the stranger guests and the readiness with which she obeyed Abraham on that occasion, Gen. xviii. 6; and in connection with the sequel refers to Gen. xx. But the sense is probably more general and the reference is rather to zeal in well-doing, as in ch. ii. 15. 20.—*μὴ φοβούμεναι* may be a quotation from Prov. iii. 25: "*οὐ μὴ φοβηθήσῃ πτόησιν ἐπελθοῦσαν οὐδὲ ὁρμὰς ἀσεβῶν ἐπερχομένας.*—*πτόησις*, terror caused by something external. As those who are so full of trust in God, that they are not tenderly moved by any evil or by menaces similar to those Sarah had to pass through at the court of Pharaoh and Abimelech, cf. Heb. xi 11. The sentence contains also an exhortation to strive more and more for the courage and manly fortitude of their ancestress, cf. ch. iii. 14. [Estius says on *πτόησιν*: *quod dum facitis, non est quod metuatis quidquam mali: velut, ne maritis vestris displiceatis, si minus corruptæ inceditis: aut ne serviliter vos tractent, si faciles ad obsequium vos præbeatis, ut solet sexus muliebris vanis pavoribus esse obnoxius. Sed et si forte nacti estis maritos iniquiores, silentio potius ac patientia, quam multis verbis studete eorum animos lenire.*" cf. Lke. xxi. 9; xxiv. 37.—M.]

Ver. 7. **Ye husbands, in like manner, dwelling according to knowledge with the feminine, as with the weaker vessel.**—'Ὁμοίως refers back to ch. ii. 17 as in v. 1. Weiss wrongly maintains that the exhortation to Christian husbands is out of place in this connection because it does not coincide with the point of view indicated at ch. ii. 11. 12. But why should it not coincide, if the Apostle addresses in turn the different conditions and classes of Christians, and shows to each how they should walk worthily among the Gentiles, honour all men and fear God? It would rather have been a grave omission, had he not reminded husbands of *their* duties; the exhortation was indeed peculiarly needed in order to avoid all misunderstanding and abuse of the obedience of women.—His first precept to husbands relates to *συνοικεῖν* =to dwell together, to have intercourse in general and then, as some of the ancients understand the word, with particular reference to conjugal intercourse. It should take place *κατὰ γνῶσιν*, according to knowledge—derived from reason and from the Gospel in respect of their peculiar relations and wants.—*ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει* should be joined to *συνοικοῦντες*; otherwise *συνοικεῖν* would have no object, *ἀπονέμοντες* would have two *ὡς*.—*σκεῦος* is widely used of vessels, clothes and things in general, Deut. xxii. 5; Lke. xvii. 31; then of men with reference to their dependence and frailty and their destination for some particular purpose. We are like vessels in the potter's hand, Jer. xviii. 6; Is. xxix. 16; xlv. 9; lxiv. 8. He can break or preserve, reject or prefer them to honour, Jer. xix. 11; xxii. 28; xlviii. 38; Hos. viii. 6; Ps. ii. 9; Rev. ii. 27; Rom. ix. 21. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 20. In particular, the body is called the vessel containing the soul, 1 Thess. iv. 4. 5. Here *σκεῦος* applies equally to husband and wife as is evident from the comparative *ἀσθενεστέρῳ*; it designates both as the handiwork of God, organized and designed for each other. The husband should be particularly moved to a considerate, loving and careful treatment of his wife by the thought:—"God himself has thus appointed and made the nature of woman."—*ἀσθενεστέρῳ*. Calov:—"Women are weak in point of sex, the constitution of their body, mind and judgment, art, aptitude and wisdom in the conduct of affairs." [Rather a sweeping judgment of woman, and as ungenerous as untrue. Woman is physically man's inferior, but it is doubtful whether she is so mentally. This is not in the writer's opinion a question of superiority or inferiority,

but one of diversity. There are mental qualities in which woman excels man and others in which he excels her. They seem to be well balanced under equal advantages afforded to each. His experience in schools constrains him to admit that up to the age of sixteen, girls are decidedly brighter and better students than boys. If they do not progress after that period in an equal ratio, the fault belongs to vicious social habits and to the superficial and fanciful ideas as to the maximum attainments of females, but not to the natural endowment of their mind. It came forth from the Creator's hand perfect after its kind, everyway adapted to man's mind and the two equally and healthily developed, working together in one direction, supply each other's defects and strengthen each other's powers. United, this natural diversity blends in harmony. An excellent discussion of this subject may be found in Adolphe Monod's "*La Femme*," Paris. 1860.—M.] Luther:—"Woman is weaker in body, more timid and less courageous than man, hence your treatment of her should be accordingly." But as woman's weakness is relative, man also being a weak, frail vessel, he, mindful of his own weakness, ought the more readily to sympathize with the weaker, *τῷ γυναικείῳ σκεύει*.

Giving honour as to those who are also fellow-inheritors of the grace of life, in order that your prayers be not hindered.—The second precept is: *ἀπονέμοντες τιμήν*: to accord *τὸ νόμιμον*, what is due; *τιμήν* with reference to ch. ii. 17. The honour due to them, honourable treatment which implies also care for their bodily wants.—The reason of this esteem: they also are fellow-heirs of the grace of life; this is a higher reason than the former, flowing from the natural relation of the sexes. Woman becomes man's equal in virtue of the gift of the grace of life accorded to and hoped for by both. —*συγκληρονόμοις*. Griesbach and others read *συγκληρονόμοι*, masculine; this reading gives the same sense, but the former is preferable, for they are destined with other believers to inherit the kingdom of heaven. *καί* denotes the participation, cf. ch. i. 4. 10. 13; Rom. viii. 17; Eph. iii. 6; Heb. xi. 9. The hypothesis is that both husband and wife are believers, or if either part be as yet unbelieving, it may become believing.—*χάριτος ζωῆς*; *χάρις* =*χάρισμα*, the gracious gift of life, of eternal life beginning here and consummated above, ci. Gal. iii. 28. Others explain: grace communicating life, or life given out of grace, *i. e.*, flowing from it.—*εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκκόπτεσθαι.* (Griesbach and others read *ἐγκόπτεσθαι* = עָכַר to be interrupted, lamed). This expression is used of the pruning, cutting down and tearing up of trees, hence to cut off [to cut off *occasion.*—M.], to hinder, render ineffectual. Common and private prayer, its power and effect are hindered, where such esteem is wanting, for prayer, in order to be effectual, exacts a reconciled mind, Matt. v. 23; vi. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8; 1 Jno. iii. 21. ["*Cum vir et uxor non sunt bene concordes, minus possunt oratione vacare et eorum orationes sunt minus exaudibiles.*" Lyra.—M.]. Roos: "There is no room for prayer that may be answered where the husband despises and tyrannizes his wife and where a marriage is marred by discord." Grotius: "Harsh treatment leads to insult and strife, which hinder the power and efficacy of prayer." Mtt. xviii. 19; Sir. xxv. 1. Wiesinger: "The consciousness of having sinned against the hope of salvation forces itself as an obstruction between God and him who prays, and thus bars the way of prayer."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The conjugal state is not a human-Divine *κτίσις*, like the secular rule, ch. ii. 13, but instituted by God Himself, Gen. ii. 18. 24; Matt. xix. 5; it is a relation of life adapted even to the royal priesthood, to the holy people of God's possession, in which they are to show forth the praises (virtues) of Him who has called us out of darkness into His marvellous light, ch. ii. 9. On the other hand, we ought not to deny the existence of a pure celibacy; so Thiersch.

2. Although the necessity of the wife obeying the husband is recognized outside of Christianity, the equality of husband and wife, in virtue of Divine appointment and grace, were altogether unknown; hence there is every where (*i. e.*, outside of Christendom) a great degradation of the female sex. "Christianity," observes Steiger, "is equi-distant from the moral degradation of the female sex, which the Mohammedans and Rabbis would almost deprive of immortality, and from the secular exaltation and deification, which, especially since the middle ages, has been defended as Christian by those who confounded Germanism with Christianity, while it secured to woman anything but happiness.

3. Peter, defining prayer as the centre and support of conjugal life, takes as lofty a conception of the matrimonial covenant as Paul, although the Pauline idea that the marriage of Christians is a figure of the relation of Christ to His Church does not occur in Peter (cf. Eph. 5).

4. True love in the conjugal state depends upon and is rooted in mutual esteem; where this is wanting, the conjugal state is shaken at its very foundation; but it is not only esteem of the personal qualities and excellencies of either part, but also, and chiefly, the appreciation flowing from the thought: Thy partner, like thyself, is a child of God, purchased with the same precious blood of Christ, and called, like thyself, to be an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

There must be some special reason why wives are reminded of their duties before the husbands, and charged with obedience as their principal and foremost task.—Christian wives need not ask, which husbands must we obey? The direction is unmistakable: your own husbands; consequently, also unbelieving, harsh, and wayward husbands.—Noble art!—to be silent with the mouth, and to speak in the life. Augustine tells of Monica, his mother, that she spoke of Christ to her husband by her feminine virtues, and that, after having borne his violence without a murmur or complaint, she gained him at the close of his life to Christ, without deploring in the believer what she had suffered at his hands as an

unbeliever.—VER. 2. There is often a veil before the eyes of a hard husband; doubt not that it can be removed, so that he may admiringly look upon the mystery of a profoundly-Christian mind, and with melted heart fall down at the feet of Jesus.—Fondness of rule and dress is a bad propensity, which is sometimes found even in Christian wives.—The proud daughters of Eve may see themselves reflected, as in a mirror, in Isaiah iii.—What is the heavenly bridal array of the believing daughters of Sarah?—Where hope in God is firmly established, no evil can terrify us.—It is the greatest calamity of wedded life to see prayer hindered and room given to Asmodeus [the devil matrimonial or disturber of married life.—M.].—How do husband and wife walk in the light of Divine truth?—It is the greatest folly if husbands act the part of tyrants to their wives.

STARKE:—Although wives should mainly fear God that they may shun evil and do good, yet ought they to fear their husbands also, that is, not only to give them no cause for suspicion and jealousy by unseemly speech, behaviour or works, Prov. vii. 10, but they should also make it their study to please them.—Holy women, influenced by the Holy Spirit, will observe the proper medium in dress, cf. Est. ii. 16; Gen. xxiv. 22; Rom. xii. 2.—Are you astonished to see persons covered with gold and pearls, with jewels and similar vanities? Rest assured that a believing soul, resplendent in virtues, is far more glorious and pleasant to God and His angels, Ps. xlv. 14. 15.—The most respectable dress! Is it to be this? You say, it does not suit me, it is old, and makes no show. Well, that depends upon whom you want to please: God?—if so, it should be glorious, but inward; or the devil, the prince of this world?—then you need not care for Peter or Christ, dress after your own fashion, Prov. vii. 10.—As the Old and the New Testaments have only one Messiah, one faith, one hope and one charity, so they have only one inward soul-ornament, Acts xv. 11; Is. lxi. 10.—Wives may lessen or increase the cares of their husbands, Prov. xxxi. 12.—If a husband and wife do not live after God's ordinance, their prayers and worship are utter vanity and loss, 1 Tim. ii. 8.

[LEIGHTON:—VER. 1. "The common spring of all mutual duties on both sides is supposed to be *love:* that peculiar conjugal love that makes them one, will infuse such sweetness into the authority of the husband and obedience of the wife, as will make their lives harmonious, like the sound of a well-tuned instrument; whereas without that, having such an universal interest in all their affairs, they cannot escape frequent contests and discords, which is a sound more unpleasant than the jarring of untuned strings to an exact ear."—M.]

[PUBLIUS SYRUS:—*Casta ad virum matrona parendo imperat.* The submissive wife rules by obedience.—M.]

[JAY:—VER. 2. Chaste conversation implies "diffidence, the blushings of reserve, the tremulous retiring of modesty, the sensation that comes from the union of innocence and danger, the prudence which keeps far from the limits of permission, the instinctive vigilance which discerns danger afar off, the caution which never allows the enemy to approach near enough even to reconnoitre."—M.]

[LEIGHTON:—*With fear.*—"Fearing the least stain of chastity, or the very least appearance of any thing not suiting with it. It is delicate, timorous grace, afraid of the least air, or shadow of any thing that hath but a resemblance of wronging it, in carriage, or speech, or apparel, as follows in the 3d and 4th verses."—M.]

[PLUTARCH:—VER. 3. *Conjug. Præcep.* c. 26. "An *ornament*, as Crates said, is that which *adorns.* The proper ornament of a woman is that which becomes her best. This is neither gold, nor pearls, nor scarlet, but those things which are an evident proof of gravity, regularity and modesty." The wife of Phocion, a celebrated Athenian general, receiving a visit from a lady who was elegantly adorned with gold and jewels, and her hair with pearls, took occasion to call the attention of her guest to the elegance and costliness of her dress; "My ornament," said the wife of Phocion, "is my husband, now for the twentieth year general of the Athenians." PLUTARCH in *Vit. Phoc.*—PLATO *De Repub.*:—"Behaviour and not gold is the ornament of a woman. To courtesans, these things, jewels and ornaments, are advantageous to their catching more admirers; but for a woman who wishes to enjoy the favour of one man, good behaviour is the proper ornament, and not dresses. And you should have the blush upon your countenance, which is the sign of modesty, instead of paint; and worth and sobriety, instead of gold and emeralds."

The sense of antiquity on this subject was very strong. CLEMENS ALEX. *Pædag.* Lib. 3, cap. 4, says: "The women that wear gold, plait their hair, paint their faces, have not the image of God in the inward man, but in lieu of it, a fornicating and adulterous soul." The *Apostolical Constitutions*, Lib. 1, cap. 8, 8, forbid women to wear exquisite garments fitted to deceive, or gold rings upon their fingers, because all these things are signs of whoredom. JAMBLICHUS in *Vita Pythag.*, Lib. 1, cap. 31, p. 165, maintains "that no free women wore gold, but whores only."—An inquiry into the sources from which false hair, now so generally worn by women, is procured, might possibly abolish this vicious and unchristian fashion.—M.]

[LEIGHTON:—Vv. 3. 4. "The soul fallen from God hath lost its true worth and beauty, and therefore it basely descends to these mean things, to serve and dress the body, and take share with it of its unworthy borrowed ornaments, while it has lost and forgotten God, and seeks not after Him, knows not that He alone is the beauty and ornament of the soul, Jer. ii. 32, and His Spirit and the grace of it, its rich attire, here particularly specified in one excellent grace; and it holds true in the rest."—M.]

[PHILIP HENRY:—"Besides this" (secret prayer) "he and his wife constantly prayed together morning and evening, and never, if they were together at home or abroad, was it intermitted; and, from his own experience of the benefit of this practice, he would take all opportunities to recommend it to those in that relation, as conducing very much to the comfort of it, and

their furtherance in that which he would often say is the great duty of yoke-fellows, and that is 'to do all they can to help one another to heaven.' He would say that this duty of husbands and wives praying together is intimated in that of the Apostle, 1 Pet. iii. 7, where they are exhorted to live as heirs of the grace of life, that their prayers (especially their prayers together) be not hindered; that nothing may be done to hinder them *from* praying together, nor to hinder them *in* it, nor to spoil the success of their prayers. This sanctifies the relation, and fetches in a blessing on it, makes the comforts of it more sweet, and the cares and crosses of it more easy, and is an excellent means of preserving and increasing love in the relation. Many to whom he had recommended the practice of this duty have blessed God for him, and for his advice concerning it."—*An Account of the Life and Death of Mr. Philip Henry, by his Son*, p. 58, Lond., 1712, quoted by Brown.—M.]

[Gataker (quoted by Brown):—"Let such married persons as God hath blessed in this kind" (by their being equally yoked in the best sense) "learn what cause they have to be thankful to God, either for other. Let the jars and discord that they see between other men and women mismatched, and the cross and cursed carriage of them, either toward other, together with the manifold annoyances and grievous mischiefs and inconveniences that ensue ordinarily thereupon, be a means to put them in mind of God's great mercy and goodness toward them, and to make them more thankful to Him for the same. And since they have received either other from God, let them therein show their thankfulness to God by endeavouring to bring either other nearer unto God, by helping either other forward in the good ways of God. Do either with other as Anna did with her son Samuel: as she had him of God, so she bestowed him on God again: return each other again to God, and labour to return them better than they received them. The better they shall make each other, and the nearer they shall bring each other to God, the more good, through God's goodness, shall they have either of other. The more man and wife profit in the fear of God, the more comfortably and contentedly shall they live together, the better shall it be for them both." From "*A Good Wife Indeed.*" The same author has also sermons entitled, "*A Good Wife, God's Gift*", "*Marriage Prayer*", and "*Marriage Duties*", which are well worth consulting.—Fordyce's *Sermons to Young Women*, in 2 vols., London, 1794 (*rare*) are also very valuable.—M.]

[Bp. Jeremy Taylor: — (*Marriage Ring*): "Marriage was ordained by God, instituted in paradise; the relief of a natural necessity, and the first blessing from the Lord. Marriage is a school and exercise of virtue. Here is the proper scene of piety and patience, of the duty of parents and the charity of relatives; here kindness is spread abroad, and love is united and made firm, as a centre. Marriage is the nursery of heaven, fills up the numbers of the elect, and hath in it the labours of love and the delicacies of friendship, the blessing of society and the union of hands and hearts. Marriage is the mother of the world, and preserves kingdoms, and fills cities, and churches, and heaven itself. Like the useful bee, marriage builds a house, and gathers sweetness from every flower, and labours, and unites into societies and republics, and sends out colonies, and feeds the world with delicacies, and obeys their king, and keeps order, and exercises many virtues, and promotes the interest of mankind, and is that state of good things to which God hath designed the present constitution of the world."—M.]

CHAPTER III. 8–17.

Analysis:—Exhortations of Christians in general, irrespective of their civil and domestic relations, to godly behaviour before an ungodly and hostile world.

8 Finally, *be ye*[1] all of one mind, having compassion one of another;[2] love as breth-
9 ren,[3] *be* pitiful,[4] *be* courteous:[5] Not rendering evil for evil, or railing:[6] but contrari-
wise[7] blessing;[8] knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a bless-
10 ing.[9] For he that will[10] love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from
11 evil, and his lips that they speak no guile:[11] Let him eschew evil,[12] and do good; let
12 him seek peace, and ensue it.[13] For[14] the eyes of the Lord *are* over[15] the righteous,
and his ears *are open* unto their prayers:[16] but the face of the Lord *is* against[17] them
13 that do evil. And who *is* he that will harm you, if ye be followers[18] of that which is
14 good? But and if[19] ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy[20] *are ye:* and be not
15 afraid of their terror,[21] neither[22] be troubled; But[23] sanctify the Lord God[24] in your
hearts: and *be* ready always to *give* an answer[25] to every man that asketh you a rea-
16 son of[26] the hope that is in you, with meakness and fear: Having a good conscience;
that, whereas[27] they speak evil of you,[28] as of evil doers, they may be ashamed that
17 falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.[29] For *it is* better, if the will of God
be so, that ye suffer for well doing than for evil doing.[30]

Verse 8. [[1] It is better to retain in English the adjectival construction of the original, substituting *being*, in Italics. instead of *be ye*.—M.]
[[2] συμπαθεῖς=sympathizing in grief and joy.—M.]
[[3] φιλάδελφοι=loving the brethren.—M.]
[[4] εὔσπλαγχνοι, literally of "strong bowels," *i. e.*, of great courage; compassionate, "*misericordes erga afflictos*."—M.]
[[5] ταπεινοφρόνες=humble-minded. The *Textus Rec.* has φιλόφρονες for ταπεινόφρονες; but Griesbach, Tischendorf, A. B. C., and many other Codd. read the latter, which forms a proper transition to the next verse. The German reads the former, which gives also a good sense. Quite a number of Codd. have both. The Cod. Sinait. has ταπινόφρονες.—M.]

Verse 9. [[6] "*Non malum pro malo in factis injuriosis, nec maledictum pro maledicto in verbis contentiosis.*" Lyra.—M.]
[[7] τοὐναντίον δὲ=nay rather on the contrary; δὲ renders the contrast more emphatic than ἀλλά.—M.]
[εὐλογοῦντες=blessing the evil doer and railer.—M.]
[[8] εἰδότες is wanting in A. B. C. K., and many other Codd.—It is also omitted in Cod. Sin.—Lachmann, Tischendorf and Alford reject it. Omitting εἰδότες, render: "Because to this end (namely, ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε) ye were called."—M.]
[[9] Blessing in general, not a specific one; omit, therefore, the indefinite article. "*Qui cœleste regnum aliquando hereditare debent, illi sunt benedicti ac filii benedictionis, non solum passive sed etiam active, benedictionem spiritualem a Deo per fidem recipientes et vicissim aliis ex caritate benedicentes.*" Gerhard.—M.]

Verse 10. [[10] θέλων=he who desires; *will* is ambiguous.—M.]
[[11] δόλον=fraud, deceit. Alford lays stress on the force of the Aorists as referring to single occasions, or better, perhaps, to the whole life considered as one fact.—M.]

Verse 11. [[12] ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ=let him turn away from evil, and so avoid it.—M.]
[[13] διωξάτω=pursue; "*inquirat pacem ut rem absconditam et persequatur eam ut rem fugitivam.*" *Glossa interlinearis*, quoted by Alford.—M.]

Verse 12. [[14] ὅτι=because.—M.]
[[15] ἐπὶ=upon (directed upon); so German, Van Ess and Alford.—M.]
[[16] δέησιν=prayer, singular.—M.]
[[17] ἐπὶ=upon (in wrath).—M.]

Verse 13. [[18] ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε=if ye be emulous of (or zealous for) that which is good?—M.]

Verse 14. [[19] ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ=but if even, cf. v. 1.—M.]
[[20] μακάριοι, not happy, but blessed.—M.]
[[21] φοβηθῆτε φόβον=be not terrified by or with their terror, viz.: the terror with which they would fain fill you. "*Sicut summum malorum, quæ lex minatur est cor pavidum et formidine plenum*, Lev. xxvi. 36; Deut. xxviii. 65, *ita maximum bonorum quæ Christus nobis promeruit inque Evangelio offert, est cor de gratia Dei certum ac proinde in omnibus adversis et periculis tranquillum.*" Gerhard.—M.]
[[22] Second μὴ=nor.—M.]

Verse 15. [[23] δὲ=may rather, cf. ch. ii. 23; Heb. ii. 6.—M.]
[[24] A. B. C., Cod. Sinait., Lachmann, Tischendorf and Alford read χριστὸν for Θεόν.—M.]
[[25] ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς=ready always for.—M.]
[[26] περὶ=concerning. Translate the whole verse: "Nay, rather sanctify Christ the Lord in your hearts, being ready always for an answer to every man that asketh of you a reason concerning the hope in you, but with meekness and fear."—M.]

Verse 16. [[27] ἐν ᾧ=in the matter in which, cf. ch. ii. 12.—M.]
[[28] A. C. K., Sinait. and others read καταλαλοῦσιν; Tischendorf and Alford, with B. and other minor MSS., καταλαλεῖσθε with the omission of ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν.—M.]
[[29] Adopting the former reading, translate the whole verse: "Having a good conscience, that in the matter in which they speak against you as evil doers, they who slander your good conversation in Christ may be ashamed."—M.]

Verse 17. [[30] Translate, with greater conformity to the original, like the German: "For it is better to suffer for doing well, if the will of God should will it so, than for doing ill." A. B. C. K. L. and other Codd., with Tischendorf and Alford, read θέλοι for θέλει, in Rec. and others.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[ON THE WHOLE SECTION.]—The Apostle hastens to conclude the Epistle, but not without laying down precepts for the conduct of Christians in general—irrespective of their social position—in their dealings with an ungodly world; he substantiates these general exhortations by indicating the feelings they ought to cherish beforehand the one toward the other.

VER. 8. **Finally, all being of one mind, sympathizing, loving the brethren, compassionate, courteous** (kind).—τὸ δὲ τέλος, adverbial Accusative, introduces the third main division, and conclusion of the Epistle.—[Oecumenius supplies the following connection: τί χρὴ ἰδιολογεῖσθαι; ἁπλῶς πᾶσι φημί. τοῦτο γὰρ τέλος καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο πᾶσιν ὁ σκόπος ἀφορᾷ τῆς σωτηρίας, καί τοῦτο νόμος πᾶσιν ἀγάπης.—M.]—ὁμόφρων =ὁμόνοος from φρήν, of one mind, agreeing in manner of thinking, so as to pursue one end, and to make choice of one way, cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. ii. 2.

[Robert Hall:—"Could we indulge the hope that such a state of things (*i. e.*, oneness of mind) was likely soon to establish itself, we should hail the dawn of a brighter day, and consider it as a nearer approach to the ultimate triumph of the Church than the annals of time have yet recorded. In the accomplishment of our Lord's prayer, that all His people may be one, men would behold a demonstration of the Divinity of His mission, which the most impious could not resist, and behold in the Church a peaceful haven inviting them to retire from the tossings and perils of this unquiet ocean, to a sacred enclosure, a sequestered spot, which the storms and tempests of the world were not permitted to invade."—M.]

συμπαθεῖς, the disposition which enters into another's weal or woe, joys with the joying, and weeps with the weeping, Rom. xii. 15; 1 Cor. xii. 25; Heb. xiii. 3. Always to see in the sufferings of others only a judicial or pædagogical element, is contrary to the mind of Christ. [Christian sympathy refutes also La Rochefaucoult's slander of human nature, that man always sees in the sufferings of others something not altogether displeasing.—M.]

φιλάδελφοι, cf. ch. i. 22; iv. 8; v. 9; Rom. xii. 10.—εὔσπλαγχνος, brave, courageous, then also tender-hearted, compassionate, as here. This quality, like that which follows, has already a bearing on our conduct in relation to the world.—φιλόφρων, kind in thought and deed, benevolent to every body.

[Leighton: — This courteousness which the

Apostle recommends is not satisfied with what goes no deeper than words or gestures. That is sometimes the upper garment of malice, saluting him aloud in the morning whom they are undermining all the day, and sometimes, though more innocent, it may be troublesome merely by the vain affectation and excess of it; and even this becomes not a wise man, much less a Christian; an over-studying or acting of this is a token of emptiness, and is below a solid mind. Nor is it that graver and wiser way of external, plausible deportment, which fully answers this word. That is the outer half, indeed, but the thing itself is a radical sweetness in the temper of the mind, that spreads itself into a man's words and actions; and this not merely natural (a gentle, kind disposition, which is, indeed, a natural advantage which some have), but spiritual, from a new nature descended from heaven, and so in its original nature it far excels the others, supplies it where it is not, and doth not only increase it where it is, but elevates it above itself, renews it, and sets a more excellent stamp upon it. See note in Appar. Crit., above.—M.]

VER. 9. **Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing, nay, rather on the contrary, blessing, because ye know that to this end ye were called.**—The Apostle, by recommending abstinence from every kind of revenge, and the love of our enemies, follows the express declarations of the Saviour; this is also evident from the reason on which he grounds the exhortation, Matt. v. 39, etc.; Lke. vi. 27, etc.; cf. Rom. xii. 17; 1 Thess. v. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 23; Lke. vi. 28.—*εὐλογεῖν*, the direct contrast of rendering evil for evil and railing for railing. To bless, to desire good, and to show it in word and deed, even as the blessing of God is a reality. The word implies, according to Calov, every kind of temporal and eternal benefits, especially the latter. [See note in Appar. Crit., above.—M.] —*εἰς τοῦτο*, viz.: to blessing, do not join to *ἵνα*, cf. ch. ii. 12. [On the other hand, see note in Appar. Crit., above.—M.]—*ἐκλήθητε*, as disciples of Jesus, and children of God, you are destined to be the light and the salt of the world, and to exert a beneficent influence on it, Matt. v. 13. 14.

That ye should inherit blessing.—The idea implied in these words is: as ye sow, so ye shall reap, as ye work, so shall be the recompense, Matt. vii. 2; v. 7; x. 32; Lke. vi. 38. [See note in Appar. Crit., above.—M.]—*κληρονομήσητε* refers, however, to the free grace in the distribution of the recompense, that it is a reward of grace, then to the title of the Sonship, and constant possession, Matt. xxv. 34. Chrysostom:—"Fire is not extinguished with fire, but with water; likewise wrong and hatred, not with retaliation, but with gentleness, humility and kindness."—Gerhard:—"Believers, if they are offended, should recollect that God has not covered them with His curse, although they deserve it just as much as others, but has blessed them with all heavenly blessing."—Weller:—"Your lot is better than that of the ungodly. God has called you to the inheritance of heaven, that you might be the children of God, and joint heirs with Christ, and become the sharers of the Divine nature. On the other hand, the ungodly are rejected from the presence of God, and excluded from that heavenly inheritance." [Christian revenge is to forgive and forget injuries, and to bury them in love.

The sandal tree perfumes, when riven,
The axe that laid it low.
Let him that hopes to be forgiven
Forgive and bless his foe.

Cf. Prov. xxv. 22; Rom. xii. 20.—M.]

VER. 10. **For he who desireth to love life —that they speak no guile.**—The exhortation to humble conduct, and the love of enemies is now substantiated by citations from the Old Testament. These embody the truth that such conduct assures us of the protection, the gracious regard and blessing of God. The Apostle quotes, without any material change, from Psalm xxxiv. v. 13 to v. 18, the second person being changed into the third in verses 13–15. Only v. 13 varies somewhat from the LXX., which reads: *ὁ θέλων ζωήν, ἀγαπῶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν*, while here we have: *ὁ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας*. Bengel says, "that the Apostle adds new salt, saying: Who really and truly loves life, who is so thoroughly in earnest about this love that he fulfils its demands." It seems better, however, to put a comma after *ζωήν*, as in the LXX. "Whoso desireth to live, and to love and see good days." The alteration may have been made with reference to those sayings of Christ which advert to a false love of life, Matt. x. 39; xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35; Lke. xvii. 33; Jno. xii. 25.—*ἰδεῖν*= רָאָה, of experience and enjoyment.—*παύειν*=to make an end of, to allay, to stop, hinder, keep back from a thing. "The expression pre-supposes the natural unruliness of the tongue and its wild, natural impulse to evil." Wiesinger. ["Calvin:—"*Primum notat, quæ lingua vitia cavenda sint, nempe ne contumeliosi ac petulantes simus: deinde ne fraudulenti ac duplices. Hinc ad facta descendit, ne quem laedamus, vel ne cui inferamus damnum.*"—M.]—*χείλη αὐτοῦ*. (Lachmann and Tischendorf omit *αὐτοῦ*).—*τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι* is governed by *ἀπό*. Winer, p. 278.—*δόλος* denotes acting the deceiver or hypocrite; מִרְמָה, cf. Jas. i. 26. David, in this verse, refers primarily to temporal life and experience, so does Peter.

VER. 11. **Let him turn away from evil—and pursue it.**—*ἐκκλίνειν* =to bend out or from, turn away from, shun, avoid, decline, Rom. iii. 12; xvi. 17; Is. i. 16. 17; Rom. xii. 9.—*ζητεῖν* = *διώκειν* elsewhere, 1 Thess. v. 15; Rom. xii. 18. [See note in Appar. Crit.—M.]

VER. 12. **Because the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous,** etc.—The reason is now given why those who act upon the preceding exhortation may cherish the hope of life and good days, and the contrary is stated.—*ὀφθαλμοί* and *πρόσωπον* are here in antithesis, the one denoting the gracious regarding of God, the other His look in anger.—*κύριος* = יְהוָה not Christ but the Father, cf. Jas. v. 4.—*ἐπί* not = against, as it has not this meaning. Understand: are directed. "We are wont to look with a severe eye on those with whom we are angry." Bengel:—"Anger excites the entire human countenance, love brightens the eyes." cf. 2 Sam. xxii. 28; Lev. xvii. 10 xx. 5; Ps. lxviii. 8.

VER. 13. **And who is he that—if ye be emulous of that which is good?**—Inference drawn from the gracious regard of God directed upon the righteous. *τίς κακώσων*, who will be *able* to harm you, who will be suffered to injure you? cf. Is. l. 9; Rom. viii. 33. The sense is not: Nobody will have any mind to harm you. Peter, at least, knew the world differently and his Master had foretold differently, ch. ii. 12. 15. 18; iii. 9; Matt. x. 24; Mk. x. 44; Jno. xiii. 16. The passage supplies therefore no new reason for peaceableness and holiness.—*μιμηταὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.* (Lachmann, Tischendorf [and Alford with A. B. C. and others.—M.], read *ζηλωταί*; that is the more difficult reading. Fronmüller) [*ζηλωταὶ* is better sustained and yields a better sense than *μιμηταί*, which later reading Alford supposes to have come in from 3 Jno. 11.—M.]. *μιμηταὶ* is elsewhere only applied to persons, here it is applied to the abstract *τὸ ἀγαθόν*, because *the good* as personified in Christ is the point of reference, cf. Tit. ii. 14; 3 Jno. 11.

VER. 14. **But if even ye suffer—be not terrified with their terror nor be troubled.**—But although God should not prevent your suffering, as indeed some of you have been already visited with suffering, ch. iv. 12. 17. 19; v. 9. 10, ye are nevertheless blessed if ye suffer on account of righteousness, as Christ says, Matt. v. 10.—*εἰ* with the Optative denotes *subjective* possibility, without any reference to definite time. Winer, p. 309. [Augustine: *martyram facit non pœna sed causa.*—M.].—*δικαιοσύνην*; cf. ch. ii. 24, not only the confession of the truth, but right and holy thinking and living, well-doing in general, cf. v. 11. 13. 17; ii. 20; Matt. v. 20; vi. 33. There is no reason for seeking here the Pauline idea of *δικαιοσύνη.*—*μακάριοι* sc. *ἐστὲ* cf. ch. i. 9; iv. 13; Job v. 17. [Bengel: "*Ne hoc quidem vitam beatam vobis aufert, immo potius auget.*"—M.].—*τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν* sc. of evil-doers, v. 12. This is a citation from Is. viii. 12. 13. *φόβον* may be taken actively of the terror which they cause, cf. Job iii. 25; Ps. xci. 5, or passively of the fear with which they are seized. In Is. viii. 12. 13, the word seems to have a passive sense, here an active one. Be not afraid of the terror which they inspire, and do not suffer yourself to be disconcerted. [But see note in Appar. Crit. above.—M.]. *ταραχθῆτε*, a climax, to become confused, disconcerted, troubled.

VER. 15. **Nay, rather sanctify God the Lord in your hearts.**—*κύριον δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἁγιάσατε* =הִקְדִּישׁ, to adore God as the Holy One, to acknowledge His holiness in thought, word and deed. Mtt. vi. 9. Calvin:—"If we are convinced from the depth of our soul that the promised help of God is all-sufficient, we shall be most effectually armed against all fear." Confession, being the outer sanctification, must be united to the inner sanctification; hence the exhortation which follows cf. Rom. x. 10; Matt. x. 32. [I have adopted in Appar. Crit. the reading *κύριον δὲ τὸν χριστόν.*—M.]

Being ready always for an answer—hope in you.—*ἕτοιμοι δὲ* (Lachmann omits *δέ*; then *ἕτοιμοι* would define the sanctification). But forget not that freedom from the fear of man does not exclude but include responsibility. The Christian, says Steiger, is not bound to account for his faith to any scoffer or such like (Matt. vi. 7), but to every man asking reasons. cf. ch. iv. 5; Rom. xiv. 12; Heb. xiii. 17; Acts xxiv. 14 etc.; xxvi. 6 etc.—*ἀπολογία*, a defence, an apology, no learned theories but a brief account of the Person in whom we believe, of the testimony on which, and the reasons why we believe, and of the hope which this belief warrants us to cherish. Cornelius:—"Peter demands an answer, not a disputation."—Join *παντὶ* to *ἀπολογίαν.*—*περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος.* We have already seen, especially in the opening of the Epistle, ch. i. 3; cf. i. 13, that hope, in the Apostle's view, is the real centre of the Christian life. It is the end of regeneration, the sum-total of all the blessings of salvation, the kernel of the whole of salvation. The primitive Christians were often persecuted for their hope in the salvation of the Messiah. Every believer should become thoroughly assured of the reasons for this hope. Christian faith and the hope founded on it, must attain such vital strength in our inmost heart (*ἐν ὑμῖν*) as to be able to become a counterpoise to the lust and fear of the world. [Luther:—"*In persecutione oportet nos habere spem: si ratio spei exigitur, oportet nos habere verbum.*" Bengel:—"*Spes Christianorum sæpe commovit alios ad percontandum.*" Didymus says: "Here is a caution to those who imagine that it is enough for us to lead what is called a *moral life*, without a sound foundation of *Christian faith;* and here is a special admonition to the Clergy, to be able to solve doubts and remove difficulties which may perplex their people, and to stop the mouths of gainsayers (Tit. i. 11) and render a satisfactory *reason* of whatever they *do*, or *teach.*"—M.]

VER. 16. **With meekness and fear, having a good conscience.**—[The German version, following the Vulgate, begins v. 16 with *but with meekness, etc.*—M.]. *μετὰ πραΰτητος.* (Lachmann, Tischendorf [and Alford, following A. B. C. and many others.—M.], insert *ἀλλά* before *μετα*); the sense being—"provided" [or as Alford explains "ready, but not over ready."—M.], cf. ch. iii. 4, free from haughtiness, scorn and bitterness in the consciousness of truth and with the desire to convince.—*φόβου* in respect of God, whose cause we should not prejudice. [Alford defines *φόβου* "proper respect for man and humble reverence of God."—M.]. Luther:—"Then must ye not answer with proud words and state your cause with a defiance and with violence, as if you would tear up trees, but with such fear and humility as if ye stood before the judgment-seat of God,—so shouldest thou stand in fear, and not rely on thy own strength, but on the word and promise of Christ." Matt. x. 19; 1 Cor. ii. 3.—*συνείδησιν ἔχοντες* not coördinated with, but subordinated to *ἕτοιμοι*. Harless:—"Only he is able to defend his Christian hope with full assurance, who has kept in a good conscience, as in a good vessel, the grace he has received." cf. ch. ii. 19. A good conversation is the most telling apology before slanderers. [Calvin:—"*quia parum auctoritatis habet sermo absque vita, ideo fidei professioni bonam conscientiam adjungit.*—M.]

That in the matter in which they speak against you as evil-doers, they who slander your good conversation in Christ, may be ashamed.—*ἵνα ἐν ᾧ.*—You were not only

called to bless your enemies, but to become a blessing to them in putting them to shame, and if possible, to win them. cf. ch. ii. 12. 19. *ἐπηρεάζειν*, to use hard words, abusive and haughty conduct in order to terrify and so to coerce any one. It denotes greater hostility than *καταλαλέω*, ch. ii. 12.—*τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφήν*, see ch. ii. 12; i. 15. Join *ἐν Χριστῷ* to *ἀναστροφήν* not to *ἀγαθήν*. A conversation led in communion with Christ, looking up to Him, in His strength and with His help. They slander your good conversation, *i. e.*, you on account of your good conversation. This is to give prominence to the folly of their detraction, which sooner or later must become manifest to themselves.

Ver. 17. **For it is better to suffer for doing well, if the will of God should will it so, than for doing ill.**—*κρεῖττον γάρ*. In no event will you escape suffering. Peter now meets, as Gerhard observes, the objection: "I should not take it so hard, if I had merited it." He says: Is it not better to suffer for doing well than for doing ill?—*κρεῖττον* denotes that which is more advantageous, deserves the preference; cf. ch. ii. 19. Grotius:—"This is what Socrates said to his wife without being instructed, as we Christians are, respecting the right way and whither it leads."—*εἰ θέλοι* (The *textus rec.* reads *θέλει*; but Tischendorf [following A. B. C. K. L. and others. —M.] prefers the Optative.), cf. ch. iii. 14, if and as often as it may be His will. cf. Mtt. xviii. 14; xxvi. 39. 42; 1 Cor. iv. 19; Jas. iv. 15; 1 Peter i. 6; iv. 19.—[*εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ si placuerit voluntati divinæ*, *θέλημα* meaning the will itself, and *θέλειν* the operation of the will (like the *stream streams*,—the river flows, etc.,) cf. Jas. iii. 4, see Winer, p. 627.—M.].—*Θέλημα*, this will is known from what happens to us. [Luther:—"Go on in faith and love; if the cross comes, take it; if it comes not, do not seek it."—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The above warnings against self-revenge and exhortations to love our enemies are not peculiar to Christianity. They are already found in the Old Testament, and Christianity simply enforces them by new and stronger motives. Steiger:—"The frequent warnings against self-revenge found in this Epistle, seem to have also an individual origin in the vehemence peculiar to Peter and in his holy dread of actions similar to that in the case of Malchus."

2. The exhortation to fear God, which occurs repeatedly in this Epistle, is characteristic of the Petrine doctrine. This enforcing of fear, although more peculiar to the economy of the Law than to that of the Gospel, is equally necessary under the dispensation of the New Testament, and few Christians will be found who are past it. "As the difference of tropes (German, "*Lehrtropen*") has always a providential signification for different individualities and degrees of development of the Christian life, so it is the case here." Weiss.

3. The manner in which Peter refers to the sufferings of his contemporary fellow-believers supplies us with hints as to the date of this Epistle.

4. To draw from v. 14 the inference that in the opinion of Peter it is possible to acquire and merit heaven on account of righteousness, would be a great mistake; no, only the assurance of salvation and the degree of glory depend upon suffering for Christ's sake and suffering with Him

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Beams of the glory of God which shine forth from the character of believers.—The blessing attitude of Christians in a hostile world.—The dignity and blessing of the cherished cross.—Are we permitted to love life and to desire good days?—Of true and false peace.—The flaming eye of God upon evil-doers.—The Christian's watchword; nobody is hurt but by himself (Chrysostom has written a work on this subject).—The secret of being blessed in suffering—a good conscience, the shield and protection of believers.

Starke:—Try thyself—whether thou art of such a mind, v. 8. Mich. vi. 8.—All the members of the body are ready by sympathy to lighten the sufferings of the suffering members.—Canst thou requite evil with good? Try thyself; if thou art able, thou art a child of God, if not, it is idle conceit, Matt. v. 45.—There is no member of the body with which man is more likely and more ready to sin than with the tongue; hence we should carefully reflect upon what we speak and how we speak, Jas. iii. 5. 6; Prov. xvi. 26; xvii. 27; Sir. xxii. 33.—Peace is rare game, in the diligent pursuit of which every Christian ought to be a quick huntsman, Prov. xv. 18; xxv. 15; 2 Cor. xiii. 12. —Nothing is more likely to move us to a holy conversation than the constant and lively recollection that the eyes and ears of God are ever around us. If this cannot fill a man with holy dread, he denies God in deed, though he confess Him in words, Deut. vi. 18.—Although the godly do not cry with their mouth, they cry to God with their heart, Ps. xxxiv. 16–18. The world is enraged, Satan shows his teeth, it rains enemies: should this make thee alarmed, thou who lovest God? Hast thou not a Father who is almighty, and a King who is the Conqueror of all His enemies? Shall men, vile dust and ashes as they are, or hell itself then be able to hurt a hair of thy head unless He permit it? Be therefore courageous! the Lord be with thee; come hither, sword of the Lord and Gideon, Ps. lvi. 12.—The ungodly who persecutes the saints runs against a wall of iron and breaks his head, Jer. xx. 11. —The strength and joyfulness of faith in heavy sufferings and persecutions differs altogether from self-made stoical insensibility and hard-heartedness.—The heart is a timid thing; at the least stirring of a cross-wind [so the German.—M.] it begins to tremble as the leaves of trees. But do right, and fear not the devil, Heb. xi. 27.—The ornament of Christ's true bride is within, Ps. xlv. 10; Lke. xvii. 20.—A judicious physician makes great allowance for a delirious patient—do thou the same for those who err, Gal. vi. 1.—Silence is sometimes better than speaking, Matt. xxvii. 12. 14; Col. iv. 5. 6; Prov. xxvi. 4. 5.—Nobody should cause his own sufferings; but those which God imposes everybody should bear with patience, Lam. iii. 26. 28.—To suffer innocently is the honour, but to suffer for sin is the shame of Christians, Ch. iv. 15; Matt. v. 11.

LISCO:—Christian feeling in evil times.—The all-conquering power of faith and love of the sharers of Christ's kingdom.—The art of providing good days for one's self.

STIER:—Good days without sorrow and tribulation from without are not good for us, but would be the greatest misfortune to our souls.

STAUDT:—Direction for good days; 1. How we should live inwardly; 2. How we should live outwardly; 3. How we should live upwardly.

V. HERBERGER:—1. What is following Christ? 2. What reasons have we to do it cheerfully and readily?

[LEIGHTON: VER. 8.—Men having so many disputes about religion in their heads, and no life of religion in their hearts, fall into a conceit that all is but juggling, and the easiest way is, to believe nothing; and these agree with any or rather with none. Sometimes it is from a profane supercilious disdain of all these things, and many there be of these, of Gallio's temper, that care for none of these things and that account all questions in religion, as he did, but matter of words and names. And by this all religions may agree together; but it were not a natural union by the active heat of the spirit, but a confusion rather, by the want of it: not a knitting together, but a freezing together, as cold congregates all bodies how heterogeneous soever, sticks, stones and water; but heat makes first a separation of different things and then unites those that are of the same nature.—Beware of two extremes that often cause divisions, 1. Captivity to custom; 2. Affectation of novelty.—The scales of Leviathan, as Luther expresses it, are linked together; shall not the Lord's followers be one in Him? They unite to undermine the peace of the Church, shall not the godly join their prayers to countermine them?—Says one: "Nothing truly shows a spiritual man so much, as the dealing with another man's sin."—Sin broke all to pieces, man from God and one from another. Christ's work in the world was *union*.—The friendships of the world, the best of them, are but tied with chains of glass, but this fraternal love of Christians is a golden chain, both more precious, and more strong and lasting; the others are worthless and brittle.—The roots of plants are hid under ground, so that themselves are not seen, but they appear in their branches and flowers and fruits, which argue there is a root and life in them; thus the graces of the Spirit, planted in the soul, though themselves invisible, yet discover their being and life in the tract of a Christian's life, his words and actions, and the frame of his carriage. . . Faith worketh by love, so then where this root is, these roots will spring from it and discover it, pity and courtesy.—He whom the Lord loads most with his richest gifts, stoops lowest, as pressed down with the weight of them; the free love of God humbles the heart most to which it is most manifested.

VER. 9. One man's sin cannot procure privilege to another to sin in that or the like kind. If another has broken the bonds of allegiance to God and charity to thee, yet thou art not the less tied by the same bonds still.

VER. 11. We may pursue peace among men and not overtake it; we may use all good means and fall short; but pursue it up as far as the throne of grace; seek it by prayer and that will overtake it; that will be sure to find it in God's hand, "who stilleth the waves of the sea and the tumults of the people." "If He give quietness, who can give trouble?"

VER. 14. It is a confirmed observation by the experience of all ages, that when the Church flourished most in outward peace and wealth, it abated most of its spiritual lustre (*opibus major, virtutibus minor*) which is its genuine and true beauty: and when it seemed most miserable by persecutions and sufferings, it was most happy in sincerity and zeal and vigour of grace. When the moon shines brightest towards the earth, it is dark heavenwards, and on the contrary when it appears not, is nearest the sun and clear towards heaven."—M.]

VER. 15. Beware of an external, superficial, sanctifying of God, for He takes it not so; He will interpret that a profaning of Him and His name. Be not deceived, He is not mocked; He looks through all visages and appearances, in upon the heart, sees how it entertains Him, and stands affected to Him, if it be possessed with reverence and love more than either thy tongue or carriage can express; and if it be not so, all thy seeming worship is but injury, and thy speaking of Him is but babbling, be thy discourse ever so excellent; yea, the more thou hast seemed to sanctify God while thy heart has not been chief in the business, thou shalt not by such service have the less, but the more fear and trouble in the day of trouble, when it comes upon thee.

[VER. 8. The following passage from Polybius quoted by Raphelius, *Obs.* Vol. II. p. 760, beautifully illustrates συμπαθεῖς: "Certainly, if Scipio was peculiarly fitted by nature for any thing, it was for this, that he should inspire confidence in the minds of men, καὶ συμπαθεῖς ποιῆσαι τοὺς παρακαλουμένους; *i. e.*, make those whom he addressed have the same feelings."—M.]

[VER. 10. "A certain person travelling through the city, continued to call out, *Who wants the elixir of life?* The daughter of Rabbi Joda heard him and told her father. He said, Call the man in. When he came in, the Rabbi said, What is that elixir of life thou sellest? He answered, Is it not written, What man is he that loveth life and desireth to see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil and his lips from speaking guile? This is the elixir of life and is found in the mouth of man." Quoted by Rosenmüller from the *Book of Mussar*, ch. I.—M.]

[VER. 15. POPE:—

Hope springs eternal in the human breast,—
Man never is, but always to be, blest.—M.]

[BENTLEY:—"It is certain there is no hope, without some antecedent belief, that the thing hoped for may come to pass; and the strength and stedfastness of our hope is ever proportioned to the measure of our faith."—M.]

[VINET:—"We are debtors of religious truth to our brethren, as soon as we ourselves become possessed of it;" "We are debtors in the strictest sense of the term, for, properly speaking, the truth is not the exclusive property of any one. Every good, which may be communicated by its possessor without impoverishing himself, cannot remain exclusively his own. If this proposition be not true, morality falls to the ground. How much more does this hold good of a blessing

which is multiplied by division of a spring which becomes more abundant as it pours out its waters!"

"The truth is not to be scattered at random like contemptible dust; it is a pearl that must not be exposed to be trodden under foot by the profane. To protect it by an *expressive silence* is sometimes the only way we can testify our own respect for it, or conciliate that of others. He who cannot be silent respecting it, under certain circumstances, does not sufficiently respect it. Silence is on some occasions the only homage truth expects from us. This silence has nothing in common with dissimulation; it involves no connivance with the enemies of truth: it has no other object than to protect it from needless outrage. This silence, in a majority of instances, is a language; and when in the conduct of those who maintain it, every thing is consistent with it, the truth loses nothing by being suppressed; or to speak more correctly, it is not suppressed; it is vividly, though silently pointed out; its dignity and importance are placed in relief; and the respect which occasioned this silence, itself imposes silence on the witnesses of its exhibition."—M.]

[Bp. Hall:—"The proper meaning of the Apostle's direction and its connection, with the preceding advice, may be thus stated: give ye unto God in your hearts that honour, which is due unto Him, in trusting to His promises, and reposing upon His providence, by a stedfast confidence and reliance; and since ye live among heathens and professed enemies of the Gospel, be not ye daunted with their oppositions and persecutions; but be ready, when ye are thereunto duly called, to make profession of that true faith and religion which ye have received: but let not this be done in a turbulent and seditious manner, but with all meekness of spirit and reverence to that authority, whereby ye are called thereunto."—M.]

[Chrysostom:—Ver. 14. "Should the empress determine to banish me, let her banish me; 'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof.' If she will cast me into the sea, let her cast me into the sea; I will remember Jonah. If she will throw me into a burning, fiery furnace, the three children were there before me. If she will throw me to the wild beasts, I will remember that Daniel was in the den of lions. If she will condemn me to be stoned, I shall be the associate of Stephen, the proto-martyr. If she will have me beheaded, the Baptist has submitted to the same punishment. If she will take away my substance, 'naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return to it.'" *Ep. ad Cyriacum.*—M.]

CHAPTER III. 18–22.

Analysis:—Further exhortation to readiness of suffering in consideration of a deeper motive. Only thus do we attain to resembling Christ, who suffered for our sins, whose sufferings had every where, even in the world of the dead, salutary effects, and led to the most blessed issue.

18 For[1] Christ also hath once suffered for sins,[2] the just for the unjust,[3] that he might
19 bring us to God, being put to death[4] in the flesh, but quickened[5] by the Spirit:[6] By[7]
20 which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometime[8] were
disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the
21 ark was a preparing,[9] wherein few,[10] that is, eight souls were saved by water. The
like figure[11] whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us,[12] (not the putting away of the
filth of the flesh,[13] but the answer[14] of a good conscience toward God,) by[15] the resur-
22 rection of Jesus Christ: Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God;[16]
angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.[17]

Verse 18. [1 ὅτι, because, German '*dieweil*,' better than for; it is not, as Alford puts it, *a* reason, but *the* reason, why Christian suffering for well-doing is blessed.—M.]

[2 καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν, translate: "Christ also suffered for sins once."—M.]

[3 δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων—*a* just person for unjust persons.—M.]

[4 θανατωθεὶς, Aor. put to death.—M.]

[5 ζωοποιηθεὶς, Aor. made alive.—M.]

[6 Both σαρκί and πνεύματι, are in the Dative without any preposition: the change of prepositions in the English version is peculiarly unhappy, as obscuring the sense; σαρκί and πνεύματι, are put in antithesis by the regular μὲν and δὲ; translate: "put to death indeed in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit." The German has "after the flesh" and "after the spirit."—τῷ before πνεύματι is omitted in A. B. C. K. L. and Cod. Sin.—M.]

Verse 19. [7 ἐν ᾧ—not *by* but in which, so German.—M.]

Verse 20. [8 ποτὲ ὅτε; translate: "Which were disobedient once (ποτὲ) when (ὅτε) the long-suffering of God, etc."—M.]

[9 κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ—the ark was being prepared.—M.]

[10 εἰς ἣν ὀλίγαι—in which a few persons. The construction of εἰς ἣν is pregnant, the few being saved *in* it after having entered *into* it. A. B. sustain ὀλίγοι; so does Cod. Sin.—M.]

Verse 21. [11, 12 ὃ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα. Translate: "Which (the water), as the antitype (de Wette) or 'in the antitype' (Germ. Polygl.) is now saving us even (*as* or *in*) baptism." ἡμᾶς, Rec. C. K. L. Sinait. ὑμᾶς, A. B. with many versions. σώζει, Present, the action not yet completed.—M.]

[13 "Not putting-away (subst.) the filth of the flesh."—M.]
[14 "But ἐπερώτημα, inquiry (Vulgate, de Wette, Alford) of a good conscience after God." See note below, in *Exeg.* and *Critic.*—M.]
[15 διὰ, by means of.—M.]
Verse 22. [16 Translate: "Who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven." The Vulgate adds after Θεοῦ *deglutiens mortem, ut vitæ æternæ hæredes efficeremur.*—M.]
[17 ὑποταγέντων—being subjected.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 18. **Because Christ also suffered.**—If, according to our ideas, any one ought to have been spared the cup of suffering, it was Christ; but He also suffered on account of sins and for their atonement.

Once, cf. Rom. vi. 10; Heb. vii. 27; ix. 7.—It requires not to be repeated and as compared with eternity, it is a short suffering, being compressed into the space of several years and days. It probably relates to the exhortation which follows that we also should once for all die unto sin, ch. iv. 1. (Lachmann reads: περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν.).—περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, on account of sins, cf. ch. ii. 24; Rom. viii. 3. Sins were the originating cause of His sufferings and their blotting out His aim.

A just person for (in the stead of) unjust persons.—δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων. Although ὑπέρ *per se* may be rendered "for the benefit of," yet both the circumstance that the context opposes one innocent person to many guilty persons and the word προσάγειν clearly express the idea of vicarious suffering; for προσάγειν relates to Christ's office of High-priest. Defilement by sin under the Old Testament barred all approach to God; the Priest had the privilege to draw near to God and to mediate the people's approach to Him. This is rendered in the LXX. by προσάγειν. *Vide* Weiss, cf. προσέρχεσθαι ii. 4.—The word ἅπαξ confirms this view, cf. Heb. ix. 27. 28.—The repeated reference to the sufferings of Christ shows in the opinion of Gerhard, that the Apostle cannot weary to make mention of His sufferings, hence he calls himself ch. v. 1, a witness of the sufferings of Christ.

Put to death indeed in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit.—θανατωθείς is best joined to προσάγειν. The restoration of men to the lost communion with God is conditioned by the sacrificial death of Christ, by His resurrection and royal power.—ζωοποιεῖν not = ἐγείρειν, cf. Jno. v. 21; Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 22.—σαρκί, πνεύματι; the two Datives denote the sphere to which the predicate must be supposed to be limited, cf. Winer, § 41, 8. *a*. The Datives are evidently parallel and must be taken in the same sense. The sense of the first is clear: He was put to death as to His outward, sensuous nature. If this is established, it is impossible to interpret the second member as follows: He was made alive by the spirit that had been given to Him, by the higher divine part of His nature. Weiss:—The parallelism indicated by μέν and δέ, rather requires us to render, "as to His Spirit He was made alive," (animated.). Death hardly affected the spirit and soul of Christ, but both at the moment of Christ's dying were for a short time put into a state of unconsciousness. But hardly had Christ surrendered His spirit into the hands of the Father, when the Divine Spirit filled and penetrated Him with a new Divine life. Flacius already observes: "the antithesis clearly shows that Christ was put to death as to one part of His nature, but made alive as to another. It is a *modus loquendi* taken from or alluding to the universal lot of the godly, cf. Gen. xlv. 27; 1 Thess. iii. 8. Roos:—"His soul, for its great refreshing, was endued with and penetrated by heavenly strength." Others take the view that His death ensued in virtue of the weakness inherent in the flesh, His reänimation in virtue of the strength peculiar to the Spirit, cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 4. But θανατωθείς does not well suit this interpretation, which is somewhat forced. [Luther: "This is the meaning, that Christ by His sufferings was taken from the life which is flesh and blood, as a man on earth, living, walking and standing in flesh and blood . . . and He is now placed in another life, and made alive according to the spirit, has passed into a spiritual and supernatural life, which includes in itself the whole life which Christ now has in soul and body, so that He has no longer a fleshly but a spiritual body." Hoffman, *Schriftbeweiss* 2, 337, says: "It is the same who dies and the same who is again made alive, both times the whole man Jesus, in body and soul. He ceases to live in that *that*, which is to His Personality the medium of action, falls under death; and He begins again to live, in that He receives back this same for a medium of His action again. The life which fell under death was a fleshly life, that is, such a life as has its determination to the present condition of man's nature, to the externality of its mundane connection. The life which was won back is a spiritual life, that is, such a life as has its determination from the Spirit, in which consists our inner connection with God."—M.] [Wordsworth: "St. Peter thus guards his readers against the heresy of *Simon Magus*, and the *Docetæ*, who said that Christ's flesh was a phantom; and against that of the *Cerinthians*, and other false teachers, whose errors were propagated in Asia, who alleged that the *Christ* was only an Aeon or Emanation, which descended on the *Man Jesus*, at His Baptism, but departed from Him before His Passion."—M.]

VER. 19. **In which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison.**—Ἐν ᾧ is evidently to be joined with πνεύματι, not = διὰ πνεύματος, but really in the condition of a spirit separated from the body. Bengel:—"Christ dealt with the living in the body, with the spirits in the spirit."—καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ.—καί = even to the spirits in prison He did preach; so great was His condescension and so far reached the consequences of His voluntary, vicarious sufferings. As Paul the Apostle, Eph. iv. 9. 10, adverts to the descent of Christ to the lowest parts of the earth, doubtless in close connection with the exhortation, cf. v. 2, and with the evident meaning that the example of Christ should move believers to descend to the weakest and most abandoned persons, of whose salvation none entertained any hope, so here the descent of Christ to the world of departed spirits occurs in con-

nection with the preceding exhortations to perseverance in well-doing and suffering.—ἐν φυλακῇ not=in the realms of death, for the word always denotes a custody, a place of confinement, a prison, Rev. xx. 7; Matt. v. 25; xiv. 3; xviii. 30; xxv. 36; Mk. vi. 17. 27; Lke. ii. 8; xii. 58; xxi. 12; xxiii. 19; Jno. iii. 24; Acts v. 19; viii. 3; 2 Cor. vi. 5; Heb. xi. 36; consequently it has not the abstract sense of being bound. But this prison must be in the realms of death, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6; Matt. v. 25. 26. This evidently follows also from the comparison with 1 Pet. iv. 6. That it is not a mere condition, but a locality in Hades, is manifest both from πορευθείς, for one does not go, *i. e.*, travel into a condition, and from the parallel πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν of v. 22. As heaven is a definite locality, so is the nether-world (Hades).—The power of the death and life of Christ operates in two directions, downwards to the realms of death, and upward to the higher regions of heaven.—ἐκήρυξε. Gerhard takes it not so much of verbal as of real preaching, as in Heb. xii. 24, not in order to liberate them or to give them time for repentance, but in order to show His glorious victory to the spirits of the damned. But the *usus loquendi* of κηρύττειν, and ch. iv. 6, which should be connected with the passage under notice, militate against his view. The word occurs joined with τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35; Mk. i. 14; xvi. 15. Where it is found alone, it is understood that the chief burden of His preaching was: The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has come nigh, repent and believe the Gospel, Mk. i. 38. 15; Matt. iii. 1; iv. 17; ix. 35. It was just this kind of testimony which was to constitute the sum and substance of Apostolical preaching, Matt. x. 7; xxiv. 14; Mk. iii. 14; vi. 12; xiii. 10; Lke. ix. 2; Acts ix. 20; x. 42. 43; 1 Cor. i. 23; Phil. i. 15: 2 Tim. iv. 2. It is never used of judicial preaching. It is, therefore, by no means so indefinite an expression as Bengel supposes, but one which has a very definite meaning; further light, moreover, is shed on it by εὐηγγελίσθη of ch. iv. 6. The unequivocal sense is: Jesus proclaimed to those spirits in the prisons of Hades the beginning of a new epoch of grace, the appearance of the kingdom of God, and repentance and faith as the means of entering into the same.

Ver. 20. Now follows a further definition. They are men, who once were unbelivers, in the time of Noah. Their having repented on seeing the flood break in, or during the long interval until the coming of Christ, is a gratuitous and arbitrary conjecture. Their unbelief was practical, exhibited by their disobedience, for so Peter invariably takes ἀπειθεῖν, cf. ch. ii. 7. They ridiculed the prediction of the coming flood, and despised the exhortation to repent.

When the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was being prepared, in which a few persons, that is eight souls, were saved by water. —Ἀπεξεδέχετο (The Text. Rec. had ἅπαξ ἐξεδέχετο, but our reading is doubtless correct.), the goodness of God, exhibited as μακροθυμία, in the long postponement of punishment and judgment, and the waiting for amendment; ποτε cannot be separated without violence from the following ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε. It waited 120 years for repentance, Gen. vi. 3.—Since Noah was a preacher of righteousness in word and deed to his contemporaries, 2 Pet. ii. 5, and since the difficult building of his floating house, covering so long a space of time, ought to have excited their serious consideration, their unbelief appears so much the more culpable. — κιβωτός = תֵּבָה, the well-known name of the ark, cf. Matt. xxiv. 38; Lke. xvii. 27; Heb. xi. 7.—κατασκευαζομένης denotes the difficulty and long duration of the building which was progressing in their sight.—εἰς ἥν ὀλίγαι, into which a few souls fled, and were saved, through, and by means of, the water. διά suggests both ideas in connection with the comparison with baptism which follows.

A few persons, put designedly, not only because, as Steiger remarks, this narrative shows *per se* the relation of believers and unbelievers, but also because the fact itself supplies the strongest motive for Christ's descent into the realms of death, as an act demanded by the grace of God. Only eight souls were saved in the deluge—many thousands and thousands, who were very diverse as to their moral condition, perished; how conclusive, therefore, the inference that that event took place in the world of spirits, which Peter, however, knew, not from inferences he had drawn, but doubtless in consequence of a special revelation. As the time of Noah was elsewhere viewed as an important type of after-times, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 5; iii. 6. 7; Matt. xxiv. 37, etc., so here also it ought to be taken in a typical sense, while the activity of Jesus ought not to be considered as being limited to the generation of Noah. By the example of Noah's family, Peter was taught the dealings of God with all men, who, without any fault of theirs, have not known the salvation in Christ. This passage of Christ's descent into Hades belongs to those which have suffered most from the treatment of commentators. Some distorted the preaching of Christ into mediate preaching by Noah or the Apostles, others into preaching, which, although having taken place immediately in the realms of death, was yet confined to the godly only. Steiger has enumerated their vagaries; they carry their confutation within themselves, and rest, one and all, on dogmatical embarrassment. Our explanation is supported by many passages, *e. g.*, Acts ii. 27. 31; Ps. xvi. 10; Eph. iv. 8; Acts xiii. 35–37; ii. 24; Lke. xxiii. 46; Mk. xv. 37–39; Phil. ii. 10; Lke. xvi. 19. Cf. Koenig, *Christ's Descent into Hell;* Güder, *Doctrine of Christ's Appearing among the Dead;* Zezschwiz, *Petri ap. de Christi ad inferos descensu sententia;* Herzog, *Real-Encyclopædie*, Art. *Hades;* [and the *Excursus* on the *Descensus ad Inferos* at the end of this section.—M.]

[Wordsworth:—"St. Peter's Epistle was probably written in the East (see v. 13). There the belief in *two opposite principles*, (dualism), a Good and Evil, was widely disseminated by the religion of Zoroaster, and by the Magi of Persia (see Ps. xlv. 3–7). There also the Ark rested after the waters of the Flood.

The author of this Epistle, written in the East, may have heard the objection raised, on the history of the Flood, against the Divine Benevolence and the Unity of the Godhead, and he appears to

be answering such objections as those, and to be vindicating that history. He shows the harmony of God's dispensations, Patriarchal and Evangelical. He teaches us to behold in the Ark a type of the Church, and in the Flood a type of Baptism. He thus refutes the Manichæan heresy. He says that God was merciful, even to that generation. He speaks of God's *long-suffering, waiting for them while* the Ark was preparing. He states boldly the *objection*, that *few, only eight souls*, were saved in the Ark, and contrasts the condition of those who were drowned in the Flood with the condition of those who have now offers of salvation in Baptism. He says that the rest disobeyed while the Ark was preparing. He uses the Aorist tense (ἀπειθήσασι). He does *not* say, when the Ark had been *prepared*, and when the Ark was *shut*, and when the Flood came, and it was too late for them to reach it, they all remained impenitent. Perhaps some were penitent at the eleventh hour, like the thief on the cross. Every one will be justly dealt with by God. There are *degrees of punishment*, as there are of *reward* (see Matt. x. 15; Lke. xii. 48). God does not quench the smoking flax (Matt. xii. 20). And St. Peter, by saying that they did *not* hearken *formerly*, while the Ark was preparing, almost seems to suggest the inference that they *did* hearken *now*, when One greater than Noah came in His human spirit into the abysses of the deep of the lower world, and that a happy change was wrought in the condition of some among them by His coming."—M.]

Ver. 21. **Which, in the antitype, is now saving us.**—*ὃ καὶ ἡμᾶς* (The Textus. Rec. reads ᾧ, an easier reading. Lachmann reads ὑμᾶς instead of ἡμᾶς; so also Tischendorf;) resumes v. 18, after the Apostle's manner of returning after a parenthesis, to what had gone before, and by making it the subject of further elucidation, cf. ch. ii. 24. 21. The thoughts now mentioned are by no means accidental, and such as might have been omitted, but the προσάγειν of v. 18 remained to be explained, as to the manner how it was effected, viz.: by baptism, whereof that saving water was a type.—*ὃ* relates to ὕδωρ. *καί*, similar to the members of Noah's family.—*ἀντίτυπον*, antitypal, in the antitype, that is, as baptism. Two appositions to ὕδωρ. The water of the flood is here viewed only in the light of having been saving to Noah and his family, inasmuch as it carried the ark.—*σώζει*, the Present is used because the saving has only begun and is not yet completed.

Not putting-away the filth of the flesh, but inquiry of a good conscience after God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.—Now follows a more particular account of the nature of baptism, first, negatively, then, positively. The end contemplated is not, as in the case of Jewish lustrations, purification from the filth of the body. Steiger cites Justin Martyr, *Tryph.* p. 331, "Of what avail is that baptism, (that of the Jewish lustrations) which cleanses the flesh and the body only?" It is rather an ἐπερώτημα συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς. In explaining this dark passage, it is necessary to begin with the more lucid points. The antithesis of the putting-away of the filth of the flesh suggests a reference to the moral import of baptism, to inward, spiritual cleansing. Hence the Apostle names this ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις as the end contemplated in baptism. With this we have to connect the apposition *εἰς Θεόν*, for a good conscience toward God, which is much more than a good conscience toward men (1 Cor. iv. 4), is just what we need. Connecting, with the majority of commentators, *εἰς Θεόν* with *ἐπερώτημα*, as indicating the end of *ἐπερώτημα*, would yield a very harsh expression, which cannot be illustrated by 2 Sam. xi. 7, besides, the apposition would then appear to be superfluous. But since the Genitive ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως corresponds with ῥύπου σαρκός, it must be like the latter, the *Genit. objecti*, not the *Genit. subjecti*. As to the matter itself, the good conscience cannot be supposed to be existing at baptism and preceding it, for the Apostle elsewhere regards a good conscience as something received at, and effected by, baptism, Acts ii. 38. If the good conscience were anterior to baptism, it would be difficult to see how salvation, by means of baptism, could be necessary. What, then, is the meaning of *ἐπερώτημα*, which occurs only once, and that in this passage, in the New Testament? We should expect a word signifying the cleansing of the conscience: but *ἐπερώτημα* is never used in such a sense; nor does it signify promise or pledge, as Grotius explains the word from the usage of Roman law, nor address, confidence, open approach, but simply asking, inquiry. This gives quite a good sense: baptism is the inquiry for a good conscience before God, the desire and longing for it. This would define the subjective side of baptism, with reference to the circumstance that from the earliest time certain questions relating to the state of his conscience were proposed to the candidate for baptism. Lutz approaches the right explanation: "Baptism is the request for a good conscience, for admittance to the state of reconciliation on the part of such as have a good conscience toward God, a petition for the pardon of sin, which is obtained by the merits of Christ." Similar are the views of Wiesinger and Weiss, except that they erroneously join *εἰς Θεόν* and *ἐπερώτημα*. Adhering to the idea of asking, the thing asked may be conceived, as follows: How shall I rid myself of an evil conscience? Wilt Thou, most holy God, again accept me, a sinner? Wilt Thou, Lord Jesus, grant me the communion of Thy death and life? Wilt Thou, O Holy Ghost, assure me of grace and adoption, and dwell in my heart? To these questions the Triune Jehovah answers in baptism, *Yea*. Now is laid the solid foundation for a good conscience. The conscience is not only purified from its guilt, but it receives new vital power by means of the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

δι' ἀναστάσεως is better joined with συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς than with σώζει, from which it is too far separated. In ch. i. 3, the living hope is based on the resurrection of Jesus Christ, here, the good conscience. The mediating features of προσάγειν τῷ Θεῷ and of σώζειν have now been indicated. [Most commentators connect δι' ἀναστάσεως with σώζει, treating the intervening sentence as a parenthesis.—M.]

[Wordsworth:—From the *Book of Common Prayer:* "Baptism represents to us our profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him, that as He died and rose again for us, so we who are

baptized and buried with Christ in His death, should be dead to sin and live unto righteousness," "continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living," in order that we who are "baptized into His death may pass through the grave and gate of death to our joyful Resurrection, through His merits who died, and was buried, and rose again for us, Jesus Christ, our Lord."

Waterland, *On Justification*, p. 440:—"St. Peter assures us that Baptism saves; that is, it gives a just *title* to salvation, which is the same as to say that it conveys *justification*. But then it must be understood, not of the *outward washing*, but of the *inward lively faith stipulated* in it and by it. Baptism concurs with Faith, and Faith with Baptism, and the *Holy Spirit* with both; and so the merits of Christ are savingly applied. Faith *alone* will not ordinarily serve in this case, but it must be a *contracting* faith on *man's part*, contracting in form corresponding to the federal promises and engagements on *God's part;* therefore, Tertullian rightly styles Baptism *obsignatio fidei*, *testatio fidei*, *sponsio salutis*, *fidei pactio*, and the like."

Baptismal interrogatories were used in the primitive, even in the Apostolical Church, and Peter seems to refer to them here. See Acts viii. 37; Heb. vi. 1. 2; cf. Rom. x. 10. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 1, c. 61; Tertullian, *de Spect.*, c. 4; *de Coronâ Mil.*, c. 3, and *de Resurrect. Carnis*, c. 48. "ANIMA NON LAVATIONE SED *responsione* SANCITUR." Cf. Cyprian, *Ep.* 70, 76, 85; Hippolytus, *Theophan.*, c. 10; Origen, *Exhortatio ad Martyr*, c. 12; Vales in Euseb. 7, 8, and Euseb. 7, 9, where Dionysius, Bp. of Alexandria, in the third century, speaks of a person who was present at the baptism of some who were lately baptized, and heard the *questions* and *answers*, τῶν ἐπερωτήσεων καὶ ἀποκρίσεων. See more in Wordsworth.—M.]

VER. 22. **Who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven, angels and authorities and powers being subjected unto him.**—Now follows, as the further consequence of the sufferings of Christ, His ascension into heaven, and exaltation to the right hand of God. A former sufferer is now exalted to the highest dignity of heaven. Thus this verse beautifully connects with the exhortation to willingness of suffering, cf. vv. 17. 18, and paves the way for ch. iv. 1, etc.—ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ; cf. Ps. cx. 1; Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1; Heb. i. 3; Phil. iii. 20. He has been received as sharer of the Divine government. He is not only King of His Church, but of the whole world.—πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν=having gone into heaven. It is incorrect that this designates, not a locality of the universe, but a relation to the world. Wiesinger.—ὑποταγέντων, cf. Heb. i. 4; Eph. i. 21; Col. ii. 10. The spirits, in their various gradations, are now subjected to Him who has suffered so much and so deeply. We do not pretend to determine whether they can be distinguished, with Hoffmann, as ἄγγελοι, inasmuch as they are the executors of the Divine will, as ἐξουσίαι, inasmuch as they sway authority in this world, and δυνάμεις, because they bring about the alternations of this world, cf. Matt. xxviii. 18; Lke. xxiv. 49; Acts ii. 32–35; iii. 21. 26; iv. 10–12; x. 40–42.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The fact that the Apostles do not separate the vicarious element of the sufferings of Christ from its typical element suggests an important hint to preachers as to the treatment of the atonement of Jesus.

2. The restoration of the lost communion of sinners with God is, according to v. 18, one of the main ends of the sufferings of Christ; but His resurrection is also a co-operating factor in this great work, v. 21.

3. There are no stronger motives for perseverance in well-doing, even where it involves the endurance of great suffering, than those taken from the innocent and vicarious sufferings and death of Jesus. As His sufferings and death conducted Him to life and to a greatly blessed sphere of work, so we are warranted to believe, if through suffering for righteousness we are made like Him, that suffering and death itself will also conduct us, and others by us, to life and blessedness. That which has affected the Head will also in different degrees affect the members, cf. Eph. ii. 5–7.

4. Christ's descent into hell, or rather into Hades, which transpired, not after, but before His resurrection (cf. Acts ii. 27. 31), is by no means a subordinate point in the Apostle's creed that may be surrendered to unbelief, but a fundamental article. But doubtless it is not founded, as Weiss assumes, on a conclusion reached by the Apostle's reasoning, as if he had inferred the necessity of Christ's preaching among the dead, both from the exclusiveness of the salvation wrought by Christ only, and from the justice of God, but rather on an illumination of the Holy Ghost, whose organs the Apostles were. The justice and love of God now appear to us in glorious light, and withhold the definite sentence of condemnation until all men have decided with full consciousness concerning Christ and His Gospel. He is set as the rock of salvation or stone of stumbling for all the world, ch. ii. 6, etc.

5. Hades is not the final, absolute place and state of punishment; this is evident from Rev. xx. 14. 10; the lake of fire and brimstone, the fiery pit, γέεννα, is that final place. There are in Hades two provinces or regions, separated from one another by a gulf. The one is a place of repose, comfort and refreshing, Abraham's bosom, Lke. xvi. 22, probably that paradise to which before His resurrection and ascension (Jno. xx. 17) Jesus went with the thief, Lke. xxiii. 43; lower paradise, as contrasted with the upper, to which Paul was transported, 2 Cor. xii. 2. 4; cf. Rev. ii. 7. Another part of the lower world contains the different prisons of human souls, who in their bodily existence had despised the word of God, acted against the light of conscience, and died in guilty unbelief. Here Jesus, as a spirit, appeared to fallen spirits, to some as Conqueror and Judge, to others, who still stretched out to Him the hand of faith, as a Saviour. We may, therefore, suppose with König that the preaching of Christ begun in the realms of departed spir-

its is continued there in a manner adapted to the relation of the world of the dead, and analogous to the manner in which such provision has been made adapted to our earthly relations (cf. 1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9), so that those who here on earth did not hear at all, or not in the right way, the good news of salvation through Jesus Christ, shall hear it there. If this truth had always been sufficiently recognized, the anti-scriptural opinion of universal recovery would hardly have found such extensive circulation. [But see the *Excursus*, below.—M.]

6. Baptism is here taken as a means of grace, although not described from every point of view, but only according to its subjective condition, the desire for a good conscience, which coincides with μετάνοια and according to its saving power which is mediated by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

7. This passage in connection with Acts v. 32 contains a testimony for the visible ascension of Christ, which has recently been questioned, and, alas! occasionally also by professedly believing teachers.

8. "The doctrine of this section has," as Richter says, "nothing in common with the heresies of purgatory and universal recovery. But it affords a lucid example that the atonement once made (v. 18) is of universal import for all men and for all times. It affects even the dead, and the decision of their eternal destiny depends upon their relation to the announcement of the death and resurrection of Christ."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Suffer gladly for Christ's sake, because He also has suffered for you and for all. Look at the glory into which your Head has entered through suffering.—Consider that suffering happens to us only once in the flesh, v. 18, and that it has manifold blessings for us and for others.—The universal sin-offering of Jesus, the fulfilment of all the typical offerings.—The atonement having been made for all men, must also be preached to all men.—It was part of the reward of the perfect obedience of Christ that He should receive the keys of hell and death. Hence He was able to enter the realms of death and remove thence as many as He chose without the ruler of those prisons being able to prevent it.—There are in the prisons of the unhappy realms of death, in which unconverted souls are detained unto judgment, differences and degrees of which some are more supportable and others more fearful and insupportable, Matt. x. 15; xi. 22.—The descent of Christ into the dark and horrible regions of the world of the dead exhibits the stupendous power of His commiserating love.—Christ appearing to them as Conqueror and Judge, did not proclaim to them the sentence of condemnation but announced to them the only way of salvation from their long, more than two thousand years' imprisonment.—Let nobody die with the false consolation of hearing the Gospel hereafter in the world of death.—As here, so beyond the grave, there are not wanting witnesses of Christ and preachers of the Gospel.—The success of Christ's preaching in those prisons is not recorded; Peter may intend to give a hint on the subject in mentioning the few who escaped the flood.—A threefold fruit of the sufferings of Christ: 1. He *has* brought us to God by reconciling us to God through His blood and becoming our peace, Rom. v. 10; Eph. ii. 13; Col. i. 20. 2. He *brings* us daily to God, for through Him we have access to the Father by faith, Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 18, and by His Spirit He renews us day by day. 3. He *will* bring us to God in the end, when it shall appear what we shall be.

BESSER:—"It is infinitely better to suffer once with Christ than to suffer eternally without Christ."

BEDE:—"The ark was lifted up with Noah and his family: so we are carried upward and made citizens of the kingdom of heaven by baptism. As the water of itself did not save Noah, but only by means of the ark, so the water of baptism saves us not as water only but as water with the true ark which is Christ. All the power of baptism flows from the sufferings of Christ, from the wood of the cross." Despair not, little flock; look through the mist of thy tribulation upward to the Prince of glory, to thy King, before whom every thing lies prostrate.—To what manifold and rich glory do sufferings lead!—How will it fare with those who cause tribulation to believers?—Do not abuse the long-suffering of God, believe that the punishment of God comes irresistibly and with more fearful weight, if His grace has been neglected.

STARKE:—Away, popish mass! We need no more offering for sin. The one offering of Christ is mighty and valid for eternity, Heb. x. 12.—O, the riches of the love of God and of Christ! For a righteous man one will perhaps suffer a little, but Christ has suffered every thing for sinners, Rom. v. 7. 8. 10.—The vengeance of God comes slowly but it strikes hard. Long spared, fearfully punished; such has been the experience of thousands who lived after the first world, 1 Cor. x. 6, etc.—Our baptism should continually remind us not to act against the dictates of our conscience or to sin against God, Rom. vi. 4.—There are orders among the holy angels, although we do not understand their nature and condition, Col. i. 16.

LISCO:—The glory of the grace of Christ.—The duty of Christians to make a good confession in word and deed.—The history of the victory of Jesus Christ, the Head of the kingdom.

[As FRONMUELLER's views on this passage, ch. iii. 19. 20 and iv. 6 are rather onesided and the doctrinal inferences drawn from them laid down rather too dogmatically, it is but fair that the question in all its bearings should be laid before the readers of this Commentary, which is done in the subjoined excursus, taken from an article prepared by me for the *Evangelical Review*. January 1866.—M.]

EXCURSUS ON THE DESCENSUS AD INFEROS.

[*The object of our Lord's descent to Hades.*—The passage, 1 Peter iii. 19, stands in the context from ver. 18-20, in a literal and grammatical translation, as follows: "Because Christ also suffered for sins once, a just person on behalf of unjust, in order that He might present us to God; put to death indeed in the flesh, but made alive

in the spirit, in which also He went and preached to the spirits in prison, which were disobedient formerly, when the long suffering of God was waiting in the days of Noah while the ark was preparing," etc. The reasons for this translation appear from the exegesis, to which we now proceed.

ὅτι, v. 18, gives the reason why suffering for well-doing is better than suffering for evil-doing; because it establishes the conformity of Christians to Christ their Head. *He* suffered for sins once, that is, He voluntarily underwent suffering for *our* sins: He made Himself our sin-offering, He suffered *in our stead*, and His sufferings were the means of *everlasting blessedness to others* and of eternal glory to Himself; so we also suffer, and for sins, not indeed for the sins of others, but for our own, and by parity of reasoning it follows that the sufferings of Christians not only conform them to Christ (with reverence be it spoken), but are the means of everlasting blessedness to themselves and of eternal glory to Christ. This applies not to *all* suffering, but only to suffering for *well-doing*. This "beam of comforting light falls on the sufferings of Christians from this ἅπαξ through καί," BESSER. καί indicates the analogy and shows that ἅπαξ belongs to Christ and His followers. He suffered once and once only, once for all. So it will be with us. Our suffering is only once, limited to a short space of time; it is only for a season, and our present suffering is not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us. The way to glory lies through the valley of humiliation. *Christ* suffered as a just person on behalf of unjust; of course the comparison is only relative, for although we are called δίκαιοι in v. 12, and suffer as ἄδικοι, yet is our δικαιοσύνη infinitely inferior to that of Christ, and our suffering not vicarious like *His*, for we suffer not ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, but περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. The end of our Lord's suffering is stated in the words ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ, "that He might bring us near to God." "This is the fruit of our Lord's passion, that He brings the wanderers back to the Father, and the lost to the homes of blessedness;"* or, in the words of BENGEL: "That going Himself to the Father, He might bring in, who had been alienated, *but now* justified, together with Him into heaven, v. 22, by the selfsame steps of humiliation and exaltation, which He Himself had trodden. From this verse onward to ch. iv. 6, Peter thoroughly links together the course of progress of Christ and believers (wherein He Himself followed the Lord according to His prediction, John xiii. 36), in conjunction with the unbelief and punishment of the many."† The Apostle next proceeds to specify the manner how Christ opened the way of our being brought to God. We have here a double antithesis θανατωθείς and ζωοποιηθείς, and σαρκί and πνεύματι; the two nouns have been variously explained. OECUM., THEOPH., GERHARD, CLARIUS, CALOV, HORNEIUS, CAPELLUS makes them erroneously to denote the *human* and the *divine* natures of Christ; CASTELLIO (also CORN. A LAP., FLACIUS, ESTIUS, BENGEL) interprets: *Corpore necatus, animo in vitam revocatus;* GROTIUS paraphrases σαρκί by "*quod attinet ad vitam hanc fragilem et caducam*," and explains πνεύματι by *that divine power*. There are many other variations; without entering upon their discussion, we hold with ALFORD that the two nouns have adverbial force and that this construction removes the difficulties which otherwise spring up. The fact is that *quod ad carnem*, Christ was put to death, *quod ad spiritum*, He was brought to life. "His flesh was the subject, recipient, vehicle of inflicted death; His spirit was the subject, recipient, vehicle of restored life. But let us beware, and proceed cautiously. What is asserted is not that the *flesh died* and the spirit was *made alive*, but that "*quoad*" the flesh the Lord died, "*quoad*" the spirit, He was made alive. He, the God-man, Christ Jesus, body and soul, ceased to live in the flesh, began to live in the *spirit;* ceased to live a fleshly mortal life, began to live a spiritual resurrection-life. His own spirit never died, as the next verse shows us." ALFORD.—"This is the meaning, that Christ by His sufferings was taken from the life which is flesh and blood, as a man on earth, living, walking and standing in flesh and blood, * * * and He is now placed in another life, and made alive according to the spirit, has passed into a spiritual and supernatural life, which includes in itself the whole life which Christ now has in soul and body, so that He has no longer a fleshly but a spiritual body." LUTHER.—"It is the same who dies and the same who is again made alive, both times the whole man, Jesus, in body and soul. He ceases to live, in that *that*, which is to His personality the medium of action, falls under death; and He begins to live, in that He receives back this same for a medium of His action again. The life which fell under death was a fleshly life, that is, such a life as has its determination to the present condition of man's nature, to the externality of its mundane connection. The life which was won back is a spiritual life, that is, such a life as has its determination from the Spirit, in which consists our inner connection with God." HOFMANN, *Schriftbeweiss*, 2, 336.

ἐν ᾧ. v. 19, clearly refers to πνεύματι and must be rendered "*in* which," not *by* which as in E. V. καί may be connected with the whole period and rendered "in which He also went, etc."—(ALFORD), or with τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι, and translated "in which He went and preached *also* (or *even*) to the spirits in prison," STEIGER. The latter construction seems preferable, for it not only avoids the awkwardness of subordinating the whole period to what precedes, but also gives prominence to the new idea that the activity of Christ reached even to the spirits in prison. On τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι see below, πορευθείς denotes the actual presence of the Spirit of Christ in the place of departed spirits, for πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν in v. 22 clearly shows that the participle must refer to local transference. Ἐκήρυξεν is= almost εὐηγγελίσατο (from cf. ch. iv. 6, whose εὐηγγελίσθη is used with reference to the dead); our verb in connection with τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is found

* BULLINGER:—*Hic est fructus passionis dominicæ, quod fugitivos reducit ad Patrem, et perditos in ædes beatas.*

† "*Ut nos qui abalienati fueramus. ipse abiens ad Patrem secum una, justificatos, adduceret in cœlum*, v. 22, *per eosdem gradus, quos ipse emensus est, exinanitionis et exaltationis. Ex hoc verbo Petrus, usque ad c.* iv. 6, *penitus connectit Christi et fidelium iter sive processum (quo etiam ipse sequebatur Dominum ex ejus prædictione*, John xiii. 36) *infidelitatem multorum et pœnam innectens.*"

in Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35; Mark i. 14; xvi. 15; it implies the preaching of the gospel in Mark i. 38. 15; Matt. iii. 1; iv. 17; ix. 35; it has this meaning in the following passages: Matt. x. 7; xxiv. 14; Mark iii. 14; vi. 12; xiii. 10; Luke ix. 2; Acts ix. 20; x. 42, 43; 1 Cor. i. 23; Phil. i. 15; 2 Tim. iv. 2; it is never used in the sense of judicial announcement and N. T. usage clothes it with the meaning "to preach the gospel."

Ver. 20 describes the character of the spirits in prison; they were still disobedient (ἀπειθήσασιν), *i. e.*, exhibited unbelief in disobedience. They derided the prediction of the coming flood, and despised the exhortation to repentance, ποτέ ὅτε distinctly marks the period of their unbelief, viz., the time during which the ark was preparing. The long suffering of God gave them one hundred and twenty years' time for repentance. In ἀπεξεδέχετο, which is doubtless the true reading (A. B. C. K. Z.) the full time during which the exercise of the Divine long-suffering took place, is brought out, just as κατασκευαζομένης intimates the difficulty and protracted duration of the building of the ark.

Sound exegesis clearly establishes the Apostolic declaration, that our Lord Jesus Christ, after His crucifixion, went in spirit to the place of departed spirits (*Hades*, *Sheol* as in Syriac) and there preached to those spirits, who, in the days of Noah, during the building of the ark, persisted in unbelief and disobedience. Why, what and with what effect he preached there, is not revealed. The Apostle's declaration, however clearly established, has been felt from the earliest times to present many and great difficulties, and occasioned an almost endless variety of interpretations, the main features of which will appear in the following classification. Making the κήρυγμα of our Lord the starting point, we have the following survey (given by Steiger):

Christ Preached. I. *Mediately:* 1, by Noah, 2, by the Apostles. II. *Immediately, in the realms of the dead:* 1. to the good; 2. to the good and the wicked; 3. to the wicked.

I. 1. *Christ preached mediately by Noah.* Augustine, Bede, Thomas Aquinas, Lyra, Hammond, Beza, Scaliger, Leighton, Horneius, Gerhard, Elsner, Benson, *al.*, and among more recent authors John Clausen, and Hofmann, (*Schriftbeweiss* II. 335—341) hold that Christ preached by Noah to his contemporaries, that preacher of righteousness not preaching of himself, but in obedience to the prompting of the spirit of Christ; so that while Noah was the instrument, Christ was virtually preaching by him. In illustration of this view we quote Augustine (Ep. 99 *ad Euodiam;* cf. also Ep. 164): "*Spiritus in carcere conclusi sunt increduli qui vixerunt temporibus Noe, quorum spiritus, i. e., animæ erant in carne et ignorantiæ tenebris velut in carcere conclusæ; Christus iis non in carne, qui nondum erat incarnatus, sed in spiritu, i. e., secundum divinitatem prædicavit;* and Beza: "Christ, says he (the Apostle), whom I have already said to be vivified by the power of the Godhead, *formerly* in the days of Noah, when the ark was preparing, going forth or coming . . . . not in a bodily form (which He had not yet assumed) but by the self-same power through which He afterwards rose from the dead, and by inspiration whereof the prophets spoke, preached to those spirits who *now suffer deserved punishment in prison*, as having *formerly* refused to listen to the admonitions of Noah?"

This kind of interpretation, notwithstanding the respectable authorities who advocate it, will be rejected by candid scholars as arbitrary and ungrammatical. As arbitrary, because the Apostle neither intimates any such figurative preaching of the spirit of Christ in Noah, nor that Noah preached at all; as ungrammatical, because

a. The subject of discourse is not the Logos but the God-Man (Calov), and the means by which He preached is not the Holy Spirit, but the spirit of Christ ἐν ᾧ sc, πνεύματι).

b. The object (πνεύματα) designates not *living* men, but departed spirits (cf. Luke xxiv. 37; Heb. xii. 23; Rev. xxii. 6).

c. The metaphorical φυλακή of Augustine "*caro et ignorantiæ tenebræ*" and the "*qui nunc in carcere meritas dant pœnas*" of Beza are inadmissible, the former because it destroys all local reference and thus spiritualizes away the historical value of the Apostle's declaration, the second because it takes an unjustifiable liberty with that declaration in transferring to the *present* what manifestly belongs to the past: ἔπαθεν, θανατωθείς, ζωοποιηθείς, and πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν set forth historical events in chronological order, and the τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν "describes the local condition of the πνεύματα *as the time when the preaching took place*," (Alford).

d. ἀπειθήσασιν ποτέ interrupts the chronological order, and plainly separates the time of Christ's preaching from the time of their disobedience. Bengel says: "*Si sermo esset de præconio per Noe, τὸ aliquando aut plane omitteretur, aut cum prædicavit jungeretur;*" and Flacius, as he disjoins the kind of preaching from the disobedience of those spirits, so on the other hand, he conjoins it with their imprisonment or captivity.

e. πορευθείς, as compared with v. 22, cannot be resolved into a pleonasm; giving to the words their common meaning πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξε must mean, "he went away and preached." (Hensler).

I. 2. *Christ preached mediately by the Apostles.* This is the view advocated by Socinus, Vorst, Grotius, Schöttgen, Schlichting and Hensler. It is distinguished, like I, 1, by the metaphorical interpretation of τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν; ἐν φυλακῇ=the prison of the body (Grotius) or=the prison of sin (Socinus, Schlichting, Hensler;) and the πνεύματα either=the Jews (*sub jugo legis existentes,*) or=the Jews and Gentiles (*sub potestate diaboli jacentes*). ποτέ is explained in the sense that those to whom Christ preached have *now* ceased to be unbelievers; Hensler, who gives this explanation, is constrained to read in the next clause ὅτι. But it is a purely arbitrary assumption, unwarranted by the facts of the case that all have believed. πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, according to the advocates of this view, refers to the efficacy of Christ through the Apostles, but it requires an uncommonly fertile imagination to bring this out. The supposed analogy in Eph iv. 21; ii. 17, cannot be pressed into the service of these expositors, for the context is too plain to admit of a similar construction; the αὐτον ἠκούσατε of Eph. iv. 21 is=ἐμάθετε τόν χριστόν, v. 20, and ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, v. 21, while ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην, in Eph. ii. 17, clearly refers

back to αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, v. 14, and denotes His coming to the earth in person to make known the covenants of peace, sealed with His atoning sacrifice. On grammatical grounds this view is altogether untenable, and its advocates are constrained to wave grammatical considerations. Although HUTHER justly remarks, "How this interpretation heaps caprice on caprice, need not be shown," the following objections to it may be found useful:—

a. The πνεῦμα in which Christ preached, according to this view, must be the Holy Spirit; but this is, 1. forbidden by the context, for ἐν ᾧ refers to the πνεύματι immediately preceding it. 2. Gives a double meaning to πνεῦμα, for πνεύμασι must signify the souls of men.

b. Christ preached by the Apostles not during His bodily death, v. 18, but after His exaltation, v. 22. STEIGER.

c. πορευθείς in point of time immediately follows θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι and denotes an actual going away. These considerations abundantly refute explanations like that of GROTIUS, which we give as a sample of theological finessing: "*Adjungere voluit Petrus similitudinem a temporibus Noe, ut ostendat quanto res nunc melius per Christum quam tunc per Noen processerit.*"

We now pass on to the second class of interpretations, viz.:

II. *Christ preached immediately in the realms of the dead.*

I. *To the good.* MARCION (IRENÆUS I. 24. 27, cf. WALCH, *Hist., d. Ketzer.* I. 512; NEANDER, *Ch. Hist.* I. p. 799), held that Christ then set at liberty those whom the Old Testament describes as ungodly, but whom he (MARCION) maintained to be better than the believers of the Old Covenant, who had to stay behind in hell. The Apocryphal gospel of NICODEMUS asserts the same concerning the *truly* good (see BIRCH's *Auctarium*, p. 109–147, cf. MATTHÆI, p. 200, and EUSEB. H. E. I.). IRENÆUS (IV. 27, 2; V. 31, 1), taught that Christ announced to the pious (the patriarchs and others), the redemption He had purchased, in order to bring them into the heavenly kingdom, (cf. JUST. MART. *Dial c. Tryph.* p. 298). This is substantially the view of TERTULLIAN (*de Anima.* 7, 55), HIPPOLYTUS (*de Antichr.* c. 26), ISIDORUS (*Sent.* I. 16, 15) GREGORY THE GREAT and the GREEK CHURCH, PETR. MOGILAE, *Conf. Eccl. Gr. Orth.* I. 49, etc.; JOH. DAMASC., *de Orth. fide* III. 26), the Schoolmen (ANSELM, ALBERTUS, THOM. AQUIN.), ZWINGLE and CALVIN, ZWINGLE (*Fidei Chr. Expos. art. de. Chr.* VII.) says: "It is to be believed that He (Christ) departed from among men to be numbered with the *inferi*, and that the virtue of His redemption reached also to them, which St. Peter intimates, when he says that to the dead, *i. e.*, to those in the nether world, who, after the example of Noah, from the commencement of the world, have believed upon God, while the wicked despised His admonitions, the gospel was preached." On doctrinal ground he defends his view by the position that no one could come to heaven before Christ (Jno. iii. 13) because He must have in all things pre-eminence (Col. i. 18). (*De vera et f. rel. art. de baptismo*, p. 214, 29). CALVIN interprets φυλακή by "*specula sive ipse excubandi actus*," and describes the spirits in φυλακή as "*pias animas in spem salutis promissæ intentas, quasi eminus eam considerarent.*" Perceiving a difficulty in ἀπειθήσασί ποτε κ. τ. λ. he explains: "*Quum increduli fuissent olim; quo significat, nihil nocuisse sanctis patribus, quod impiorum multitudine pæne obruti fuerint;*" that as those believers sustained no injury to their souls from the multitude of believers that surrounded them, so also now believers are, through baptism, delivered from the world. The way in which he justifies his interpretation, sets forth views to which many, that now call themselves after the Genevan Reformer, are hardly prepared to subscribe: "*Discrepat fateor, ab hoc sensu Græca syntaxis; debuerat enim Petrus, si hoc vellet, genitivum absolutum ponere. Sed quia apostolis novum non est liberius casum unum ponere alterius loco, et videmus Petrum hic confuse multas res simul coacervare, nec vero aliter aptus sensus elici poterat; non dubitavi ita resolvere orationem implicitam, quo intelligerent lectores, alios vocari incredulos, quam quibus prædicatum fuisse evangelium dixit.*" To this class of interpreters BP. BROWNE also belongs, who makes ἐκήρυξεν to signify *proclaimed*, and explains that Christ proclaimed to the patriarchs that their redemption had been fully effected, that Satan had been conquered, that the great sacrifice had been offered up, and asks, If angels joy over one sinner that repenteth, may we not suppose Paradise filled with rapture when the soul of Jesus came among the souls of redeemed, Himself the Herald (κῆρυξ) of His own victory; BROWNE's view is that of HORSLEY (Vol. I. Serm. 20), who favours, however, in language more decided than BROWNE's, the view that Christ virtually preached to those "who had once been disobedient in the days of Noah." The difficulty of ἀπειθήσασιν BROWNE supposes to be met by the consideration that many who died in the flood were, nevertheless, saved from final damnation, which he thinks highly probable. The real difficulty, in his opinion, "consists in the fact that the proclamation of the finishing of the great work of salvation, is represented by St. Peter as having been addressed to these antediluvian penitents, and as mention is made of the penitents of later ages, who are equally interested in the tidings." We have already shown that ἐκήρυξεν cannot be diluted into a mere proclaiming or heralding forth, and we shall show, by and by, that the antediluvian *sinners*, not penitents, appear to be singled out because of the enormity of their wickedness, and that the fact of their being made the objects of Christ's tender solicitude, seems to shed the light of heaven on one of the most bewildering subjects in irreligion.

The objections to this whole view, in its different modifications, are—

a. The text says nothing whatever of the *good*, but refers explicitly to the disobedient. All interpretations which ignore this distinct and explicit reference, are arbitrary, and substitute speculation for the language of inspiration.

b. The text says nothing whatever of the *repentance* of the contemporaries of Noah, nor does any other passage of Scripture give us any information to that effect. We must, therefore, conclude that the expedient which makes those antediluvians to have repented at the breaking in of the flood, however ingenious, amounts to

simple assumption. (The last view is held by SUAREZ, ESTIUS, BELLARMINE, LUTHER on *Hos.* 4, 2, A. D. 1545, as quoted by Bengel, PETER MARTYR, OSIANDER, QUISTORP, HUTTER, GESSNER and BENGEL. The latter says: "*Probabile est nonnullos ex tanta multitudine, veniente pluvia, resipuisse: cumque non credidissent dum expectaret Deus, postea cum arca structa esset et pœna ingrueret, credere cœpisse: quibus postea Christus, eorumque similibus, se præconem gratiæ praestiterit.*" BROWNE also shares this view.)

II. 2. *Christ preached in the realms of the dead to the good and the wicked.* This is maintained by ATHANASIUS, AMBROSE, ERASMUS, CALVIN, *Instit.* 2, 16, 9. Christ's preaching to the good is described as a "*prædicatio evangelica ad consolationem*," to the wicked as a "*prædicatio legalis, exprobatoria, damnatoria ad terrorem.*" BOLTON quotes the language of Abraham to Dives (Luke 16. 23 *sq.*) in support of this view, which is however, open to the same objections as II. 1. viz.: that Scripture is silent concerning the good.

II. 3. *Christ preached in the realms of the dead to the wicked.* LUTHER (*Werke, Leipz.* Vol. XII. p. 285) appears to favour this view when he says "that one could not reject this opinion, because that which St. Peter clearly affirms, etc." Even under this head we have divergent opinions in connection with the question whether Christ manifested himself to the disobedient as Redeemer or as Judge.

FLACIUS, CALOV, BUDDEUS, WOLF, ARETIUS, *al.*, make the burden of Christ's preaching an announcement of condemnation. HOLLAZ (quoted by HUTHER) says: "*Fuit prædicatio Christi in inferno non evangelica quæ hominibus tantum in regno gratiæ annunciatur, sed legalis, elenchtica, terribilis, eaque tum verbalis, qua ipsos æterna supplicia promeritos esse convincit, tum realis immanem terrorem iis incussit.*" Against this view, it may be said—

a. That κηρύσσειν, as already stated, used of Christ and the Apostles, does not admit of such a sense, but uniformly signifies to preach the Gospel;

b. That such damnatory preaching, besides being utterly superfluous in the case of spirits already reserved to condemnation (ALFORD) is derogatory to the character of the Redeemer; Christian consciousness revolts from the thought that the holy Jesus, whose dying words were words of forgiveness and love, should have visited the realms of the dead and exulted over the misery of the damned, and publishing His triumph, have intensified their torments and made hell more of hell to them;

c. That the context forbids such a view, "As if Peter would console the faithful with the arguments, that Christ, even when dead, underwent suffering on behalf of those unbelievers" (CALVIN); for it must be borne in mind that the whole passage, of which these much controverted verses form part, is designed to show how the sufferings of Christ minister to the consolation of believers, (cf. WIESINGER, p. 241.)

We come now to the only remaining view, according to which Christ visited the realms of the dead and preached there the Gospel to the dead. This is the explicit declaration of the Apostle, who says nothing, however, of the effect of His preaching, whether many, few, or any, were converted by it. It is necessary to start with this caution, because the disregard of it has led many expositors, especially among the fathers, to unwarranted conclusions. *E. g.*, CLEMENT of Alexandria, says: "Wherefore, that He might bring them to repentance, the Lord preached also to those in Hades. But what, do not the Scriptures declare, that the Lord has preached to those that perished in the deluge, and not to these only, but to all that are in chains, and that are kept in the ward and prison-house of Hades;" adding, that while Christ preached only to those of the Old Testament, the Apostles, after His example, must have preached there, and that also to the heathen, but both only to the good, "to those that lived in the righteousness which was agreeable to the law and philosophy, yet still were not perfect, but passed through life under many short-comings." ORIGEN (on 1 Kings xxviii. *Hom.* 2) adds to this, that the prophets had also been there, in order to announce beforehand the arrival of Christ, but confines the number of the delivered also to those who, before death, had been prepared for it. This view seems to have generally spread through the Eastern Church. (See STEIGER, p. 225.) These, and similar opinions, cannot be taken as interpretations, for they superadd inferences which are not warranted by the language of St. Peter, who declares that Christ preached the Gospel in Hades to the unbelieving contemporaries of Noah; nothing more, nothing less.

It has been shown above that *Hades* denotes the place of the departed, and consists of two separate regions, kept asunder by an impassable gulf. As we know from our Lord's promise to the penitent thief, that He went on the day of His crucifixion to Paradise, so we learn from St. Peter that He preached to the spirits in prison, and that these disembodied prisoners were those of men who were disobedient in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing.

The word φυλακή cannot be rendered otherwise than *prison.* Cf. Matt. v. 25; Luke xiv. 3; xviii. 30; xxv. 36, 39, 43, 44; Mark vi. 17, 27; Luke iii. 20; xii. 58; xxi. 12; xxii. 33; xxiii. 19; John iii. 24; Acts v. 19; xii. 4 and in 13 other places; 2 Cor. vi. 5; xi. 23; Heb. xi. 36; Rev. ii. 10; xxii. 33.

The word ἐκήρυξεν has been shown to signify "preached the gospel." It has this sense in the following passages: Matt. iii. 1; iv. 17; x. 7, 27; xi. 1; Mark i. 7, 38, 39; iii. 14; v. 20; xvi. 20; Luke iv. 44; Rom. x. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 27; xv. 11; and was thus understood by IRENÆUS (4, 37, 2, p. 347, *ed Grabe.*) "*Dominum in ea quæ sunt sub terra descendisse evangelizantem adventum suum.*" (CLEMENS ALEX. *Strom.* 6, 6, ὁ κύριος δὲ οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἰς ᾅδου κατῆλθεν, ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίσασθαι. So CYRIL ALEX. on John xvi. 16, and in *Hom. Pasch.* 20.)

In concluding this Excursus, it is important to observe that the Apostle teaches nothing that bears any resemblance to the Popish notion of purgatory, since *hades* and *purgatory* are two distinct conceptions, the one being the abode of all the departed, the other a supposed place of purification for a particular class of Christians; nor does he teach universal recovery; nor does he intimate any thing in favour of a second probation after death. In addition to this caution, the reader is referred to the capital note of Rev. Dr. Schaff on Matthew XII. 32, pp. 228, 229.

CHAPTER IV. 1–6.

Analysis:—Exhortation to being armed with the mind of the sufferings of Christ, and to killing the flesh in order to make room for the life of the spirit.

1 Forasmuch then[1] as Christ hath suffered for us[2] in the flesh, arm yourselves[3] like-
wise with the same mind: for[4] he that hath suffered in the flesh[5] hath ceased[6] from
2 sin; That he[7] no longer should live the rest of *his* time in the flesh to the lusts of men,
3 but to the will of God.[8] For the time past of *our* life may suffice[9] us to have wrought
the will of the Gentiles, when[10] we walked in[11] lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, rev-
4 ellings, banquetings, and abominable[12] idolatries: Wherein[13] they think it strange that
5 ye run not with *them* to the same excess of riot,[14] speaking evil of *you:* Who shall give
6 account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For, for this cause[15]
was the gospel preached also to them that are dead,[16] that they might be judged[17] accord-
ing to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.

Verse 1. [1 οὖν—then, better than forasmuch; render, "Christ then having suffered."—M.]
[2 ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν inserted in Text. Rec., A. K. L., omitted in B. C. and by Lachmann and Tischendorf. Cod. Sin. reads ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.—M.]
[3 καὶ ὑμεῖς ὁπλίσασθε—"Do you also arm yourself with," strongly emphatic.—M.]
[4 ὅτι—because, gives a reason for τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ὁπλίσασθε.—M.]
[5 σαρκί. Text. Rec. inserts ἐν before second σαρκὶ with K., Vulgate and others; A. B. C. L., Cod. Sin, Alford omit it. σαρκί, used adverbially—*quod ad carnem.*—M.]
[6 πέπαυται, Pass.,—is made to cease; he has rest from sin. Winer § 39, 3, p. 277.—M.]

Verse 2. [7 εἰς τὸ μηκέτι—"with a view, to the end that"; depends on ὁπλίσασθε. The Greek has no pronoun, but the construction and sense require the continuance of the 2 p. Plural. The 3 p. Sing. of the English version is singularly unhappy, and obscures the sense.—M.]
[8 Render, either with Alford, "With a view no longer (μηκέτι *subjective*) by the lusts of men, but by the will of God, to live the rest of your time in the flesh"; or to avoid the awkwardness of that rendering: "To the end that, as for the rest of your time in the flesh, ye should live no longer to (as conforming to) the lusts of men but to the will of God."—M.]

Verse 3. [9 ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ἡμῖν, Text. Rec., with C. K. L.; Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, with A. B. omit ἡμῖν, Cod. Sin. has ὑμῖν. τοῦ βίου after χρόνος inserted in Text. Rec. with K. L., omitted in A. B. C., Alford, Lachmann and Tischendorf. Translate: "For sufficient is the past time (*or* the time past of your life)."—M.]
[10 Cod. Sin. has πορευόμενους, but read with Receptus, πεπορευμένους, and translate, "walking as you have done", so Alford.—M.]
[11 ἀσελγείαις, Plural.—M.]
[12 ἀθεμίτοις—lawless, godless, nefarious.—M.]

Verse 4. [13 ἐν ᾧ—at which.—M.]
[14 τῆς ἀσωτίας ἀνάχυσιν—slough or puddle of profligacy.—M.]

Verse 5. [15 εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ—for to this end.—M.]

Verse 6. [16 καὶ νεκροῖς—even to dead men.—M.]
[17 Translate: "That they might indeed be judged according to men as to the flesh (see note 5 under v. 1), but that they might (continue to) live (present tense) according to God, as to the spirit."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Christ then, having suffered for us—do you also arm yourselves with the same mind.**—*οὖν* takes up again ch. iii. 18, and shows that the subject developed in ch. iii. 19–22 is governed by the reference to the sufferings of Christ.—*ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, for our benefit and in our stead, cf. ch. iii. 18.—*σαρκί*; Roos rightly remarks that Peter never uses *σάρξ* in the bad sense in which Paul has used it several times, but only as denoting the weak, mortal nature belonging to our earthly condition.—*ἔννοια*; Wiesinger [and Calvin, Beza, Gerhard, Bengel and Erasm.-Schmidt.—M.] render it "thought," but it denotes as much as *mens*, mind, intent, resolution, as appears from a passage from Isocrates, cited by Riemer. [*οὐ γὰρ* [*οἱ Θεοὶ*] *αὐτόχειρες οὔτε τῶν ἀγαθῶν οὔτε τῶν κακῶν γίγνονται τῶν συμβαινόντων αὐτοῖς,* [*τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*], *ἀλλ' ἑκάστοις τοιαύτην ἔννοιαν ἐμποιοῦσιν, ὥστε δι ἀλλήλων ἡμῖν ἑκάτερα παραγίγνεσθαι τούτων*; see also Eur. Hel. 1026; Diodor. Sic. II. 80.—M.] Exhibit a manly, constant readiness (intent) to suffer innocently for the sins of others and for their benefit (yet not vicariously) with the purpose, as much as you are able, to remove sin and to conduct souls to God.—*ὁπλίσασθε*, cf. Rom. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. x. 4; Eph. vi. 11; use this purpose as a shield against temptation to sin.

[Arming oneself with a thought, without the *intent* or *resolution* of using it as a piece of armour for defensive warfare, conveys no very clear idea. The aforesaid commentators, who render *ἔννοιαν*, *thought*, and *ὅτι*, *that*, are clearly embarrassed about *καὶ ὑμεῖς* and *τὴν αὐτήν*, which are decisive for the interpretation given in the text. "Do *ye also* arm *yourselves* (*καὶ ὑμεῖς*) with *the same* (*τὴν αὐτήν*) mind, viz.: put on the purpose to suffer in the flesh, as Christ did, as a piece of armour." This strikes us as being far more to the point than the paraphrase of Amyraut: "*Mais encore nous nous devons armer de cette bonne pensée contre toutes sortes de tentations au mal, que celui qui a souffert en cette nature humaine, n'a desormais plus de commerce avec le péché;*" or the interpretation of Gerhard: "*ὅτι rectius accipitur expositive, exponit enim Apostolus illam cogitationem ἔννοιαν qua nos vult armari: hæc cogitatio erit vobis uistar firmissimi scuti et munimenti contra peccatum.*" It is, moreover, difficult to make good sense of

these interpretations, unless the *thought* be clothed with intent.—M.]

ὅτι must not be joined with ἔννοια, as specifying the substance of this thought, this would require ταύτην instead of τὴν αὐτήν,—but it defines the exhortation more closely. [Rendering ὅτι because, as Alford does, makes his paraphrase very forcible, "and ye will need this arming, because the course of suffering according to the flesh which ye have to undergo ending in an entire freedom from sin, your warfare with sin must be begun and carried on from this time forward."—M.]

Because He that hath suffered as to the flesh hath rest from sin.—ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκί, it appears to me, is best applied to Christ Himself; the expression then connects closely with that which precedes, and defines it. For He who has once suffered as to the flesh, which suffering includes His death, as in ch. iii. 18, has now rest from sin, He is fortified against all its assaults. [πάσχειν σαρκί means to suffer according to the flesh. Winer, p. 431. The Dative, relating to things, denotes that in reference to which an action is done, or a state exists. Winer, p. 228.—M.] He has died unto sin once, as Paul expresses it in Rom. vi. 10. 7. Hence, he who puts on His mind, and is in communion with Him, henceforth must serve sin no more. The Aorist παθών denotes an action once existing, but having now absolutely passed away. All other explanations are liable to many grammatical and psychological objections. Weiss: "He that suffers on account of sin, because of opposition to sin, thereby breaks with sin, and testifies that he will no longer obey the will of the world." But the Aorist παθών, not the Present πάσχων is used; again, many experiences might contradict the general statement, and the exhortation which follows would seem to be superfluous.—Others are compelled to have recourse to arbitrary supplements. So Steiger: "Christ suffering bodily freed us from sin, and we, participating by faith in the sufferings of Christ, die unto sin." Grotius and others, contrary to all grammatical usage, understand the passage of the crucifying and the mortification of fleshly lusts.

VER. 2. **To the end that . . . . ye should not.**—Join εἰς τὸ μηκέτι with ὁπλίσασθε, not with πέπαυται, which concludes the parenthesis. Acquire the mind which has done with sin, so that your relation to sin may be that of one who has died and is risen again, as that of Christ after His exaltation, ch. iii. 21. 22.

To the lusts of men, not to be taken as = fleshly, worldly lusts in general (κοσμικαί, σαρκικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι, Tit. ii. 12; Rom. xii. 2), not as in ch. i. 14; ii. 11, but in a narrower sense with reference to v. 4, denoting the desire of worldly-minded men, that believers also ought to live as they do, and that they ought not to single themselves out at the world's disposition to coerce them also to serve its idols. The will of God alone ought to be our pole-star. The Dative is the *dativus commodi*, to live to some one=to devote to him one's life, to place oneself at his service, cf. ch. ii. 24; Gal. ii. 19.

The rest of your time in the flesh,=the time of our pilgrimage, as in ch. i. 17. This is to indicate that our earthly life constitutes only a small part of our existence, and that to individual Christians, after their conversion, only a brief term of grace is allotted. But there is also a reference to what follows.

VER. 3. **For sufficient is the past time—to have wrought the will of the Gentiles.** —ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ἡμῖν sc. ἐστιν.—The following Infinitive depends on these words; the time past is sufficient to have wrought the will of the Gentiles. Here is an implied irony. If you believe that you are debtors to the flesh (Rom. viii. 12), and obliged to serve sin, surely you have done enough, and more than enough of it, you have abundantly done your duty in the service of sin. Grotius quotes a passage from Martial: "*Lusistis, satis est*—" you have played, it is enough. This lessens the severity of the reproach. Otherwise Bengel, who avers that penitents are seized with a loathing of sin.

τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν.—(The Text. Rec. has θέλημα). On the demands made upon them by the heathen, among whom they were obliged to live, cf. v. 2. Suppose that the readers of Peter's Epistle had been formerly heathens, his reproaching them with having formerly done the will of the Gentiles would surely be singular. This passage, therefore, renders it highly probable that he was addressing Jewish Christians, who, belonging to the chosen people of God, and having received extraordinary revelations, ought so much the less have placed themselves on a level with the heathen. Paul also reproaches the Jews with their heathenish, vicious life, Rom. ii. Only the expression ἀθέμιτοι εἰδωλολατρεῖαι might militate against our view.—Ἀθεμίτοις=things forbidden by, wrong and wicked before laws human and divine, especially opposed to the law of the Old Covenant, Acts x. 28. It is asked, Where is the evidence of such open participating on the part of the Jews of that time in such heathen iniquities? Weiss replies that the expression is susceptible of a wider meaning, that the use of the Plural intimates an enlarged application of the term, cf. Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 5; Phil. iii. 19, and that ἀθεμίτοις relates to persons on whom the law of the Old Covenant was obligatory. Grotius calls attention to their participation in the common meals of heathen communities. Those who are not satisfied with these explanations may reflect that individual former heathen may have joined those Jewish Christian congregations. [On the other hand, the strong expressions used by the Apostle seem to contemplate a great deal more than isolated participation in heathen wickedness and abomination. There is absolutely no evidence that the Jews ever went so far as the language employed indicates. Moreover, there is nothing absurd, or even strange, in the Apostle's reproach, if addressed to Gentile Christians; they had doubtless intimate relations with their friends in heathenism, and the danger of relapsing into their abominations must have been ever present, at all events, it was as great as that of modern Christians, from intercourse with worldly and ungodly people, of relapsing into the ways of an ungodly world.—M.]—κατειργάσθαι alludes to sexual sins.

Walking (as ye have done) **in—idol**

atries.—*πεπορευμένους* like *περιπατεῖν ἐν* = הָלַךְ: Lke. i. 6; Acts ix. 31; 2 Pet. ii. 10. Calov: "Not only because life is compared to a journey, but also in order to denote the eagerness with which they go on from sin to sin."—*ἀσέλγειαι*, licentious practices, the outbreaks of intemperance, and excesses of every kind, while *ἐπιθυμίαι* denote hidden sins of voluptuousness, inward unchastity and lewdness, where the power to indulge in outward acts is wanting.—*οἰνοφλυγίαι*; *φλύω* to bubble up, overflow like boiling water, intoxication.—*κῶμοι*, cf. Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 21, festive processions on days sacred to Bacchus, characterized by wild revelling, licentious songs and jests, and folly in general. Then banqueting, convivial carousing, terminating, as Eustathius remarks, in deep sleep.—*πότος*, particularly drinking in common, drinking-bouts.

Ver. 4. **At which—speaking evil of you.**—*ἐν ᾧ* relates to *ἀρκετός*. Suffering it to suffice, and giving up your former course, seems strange, and is altogether inexplicable to them. The fuller meaning is brought out by *μὴ συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν*, because you no longer join them and run with them.—*εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν*—*ἀνάχυσιν*, probably a place reached by the sea at the flood-tide, the flowed-out water forming a pool or puddle.—*ἀσωτία* from *ἄσωτος*, without salvation, past redemption, hence extravagant, voluptuous, profligate manner of life, Eph. v. 18; Tit. i. 6; Lke. xv. 13; *εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν* into which formerly they had thrown themselves, and dragged you.

[Wordsworth:—A strong and expressive metaphor, especially in countries where after violent rain the gutters are suddenly swollen and pour their contents together with violence into a common sewer. Such is the Apostolic figure of vicious companies rushing together in a filthy conference for reckless indulgence and effusion in sin, cf. Juvenal, 3, 68, "*Jam pridem Syrus in Tiberim* DEFLUXIT *Orontes*," etc., and G. Dyer's *Description of the Ruins of Rome*, vv. 62–66.—M.]

βλασφημοῦντες.—Grotius:—Of Christians as those who leave civil society; Calov:—Of the Christian religion, because it leads to a different manner of life. The two ideas may be combined.

Ver. 5. **Who shall give account—dead.**—Let not their evil speaking confuse you, they will have to render account.—*τῷ ἑτοίμως ἔχοντι*. He is fully prepared, all the means and necessary conditions are already in His hand, as described in Ps. vii. 12–14.—*ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*, cf. Acts x. 42. None can escape the judgment, it comprehends all, no matter whether at the appearing of the Judge one is alive or dead; and it may come at any moment. "Where the Apostles did not treat expressly of the time of Christ's advent, they were wont to describe it as immediately impending."

Ver. 6. **For to this end was the Gospel preached even to them that are dead.**—This evidently goes back to the important passage, ch. iii. 19. 20. The Apostle meets the objection: Can the dead also be judged? Yes, and for this very purpose Christ, as aforesaid, preached the Gospel in Hades to the dead. This is the most natural connection. Bengel takes it in conjunction with *ἑτοίμως ἔχοντι*, the Judge is ready, for the end must come after the Gospel has been preached. Steiger: "The verse is to prove not the reality, but the moral possibility, the justice of a judgment even on the dead, since the Gospel was preached to them also for the purpose of giving them the means of being delivered from the wrath of God." So Weiss and Wiesinger.—*νεκροῖς* in our exposition is not to be taken generally, as v. 5, but as applying to those spirits in prison; these are adduced by way of example, from which we may draw a conclusion affecting all other dead men, who before Christ were surely as yet more or less in prison.—*κηρύττειν* ch. iii. 19, explains *εὐηγγελίσθη*; cf. Matt. xi. 5; Rom. x. 15. The above-mentioned example is therefore simply to prove the universality of the judgment as extending also to the dead; that it is just, is a secondary point. But what is the object of that preaching which was vouchsafed to the dead and particularly to the dead of the deluge?

That they might indeed be judged—as to the spirit.—Various expositions, arising from dogmatical prejudices, have been set up with regard to this passage, which we do not refute in this place. The right exposition depends on the correct meaning of *κριθῶσι*. The tense is designedly different from *ζῶσι* in the corresponding secondary sentence. The Aorist as contrasted with the Present points to some past action; it is used of past actions, see Winer.—*ἵνα* after *εὐηγγελίσθη* refers to something subsequent to the preaching of the Gospel. This apparent contradiction is solved, if *κρίνεσθαι* is taken to denote a judicial sentence, as such decisions are made by human tribunals (*κατὰ ἀνθρώπους*). On Christ's appearing in the realms of death and preaching to them repentance and faith, the declaration that was to be published to them was as it were thus: "You have merited death both as to the body and to the soul, because of your disobedience you perished in the flood and were brought to this subterranean place of confinement; but a way of salvation has now been opened for you, so that you may live in the spirit as to God, according to the will of God." This declaration, on the one hand, must have produced a painful impression upon them, but on the other, encouraged them to accept the offered salvation. However we are not informed whether few or many [or any.—M.] did thereby attain unto spiritual life. The apposition beginning with *ἵνα* relates not to v. 5, but to ch. iii. 19, thereby shedding more light on the latter passage. How forced, as contrasted with this exposition, is that of Hofmann, that salvation was published to the dead in order that they might secure a life surviving the judgment of death which they have incurred and must continue to incur, or that of Wiesinger, that the Gospel was preached to the dead for the purpose of shaping their condition so that, while on the one hand they are judged according to the flesh (the state of death viewed as a continuing judgment according to the flesh), on the other they might be able through the judgment (Aorist) to attain, in God's way, to the immortal life of the spirit. Nor is the view of König more admissible, that in the resurrection their judgment in the body should consist in their receiving a less perfect resurrection-body. For other expositions consult Steiger

and Wiesinger. [See also the Excursus on the Descensus ad Inferos at the end of the preceding section.—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The common view, which is shared also by Gerlach, sees in v. 1, the leading idea, that to the Christian, in virtue of the communion of his heart and life with Christ, suffering in the flesh is the dying of sin. So early an expositor as Justin says: "Suffering and temptation, like a medicine, render man more free from his evil intent, and make him more sound." Tauler: "What the fire is to iron, what the crucible is to cold, such is temptation to the righteous." But this is introducing the Pauline doctrine of the communion of suffering with Christ, although the original contains no allusion to it; besides the circumstance is lost sight of, that the original says "who hath suffered," not "who is suffering." According to the exposition given above, it should be the aim of believers not to let the sins of others find a point of support in themselves in order that not sinning after the example of Christ may become their second nature.

2. The abuse which the ungodly cast on the former companions of their sin has its final reason in the circumstance that they feel themselves reproved, opposed and judged by their conversion.

3. Holy Scripture nowhere teaches the eternal damnation of those who died as heathens or non-Christians; it rather intimates in many passages that forgiveness may be possible beyond the grave, and refers the final decision not to death, but to the day of Christ, Acts xvii. 31; 2 Tim. i. 12; iv. 8; 1 Jno. iv. 17. But in our passage, as in ch. iii. 19. 20, Peter by Divine illumination clearly affirms that the ways of God's salvation do not terminate with earthly life, and that the Gospel is preached beyond the grave to those who have departed from this life without a knowledge of the same. But this proves neither the doctrine of universal recovery, even that of Satan, the devils and the ungodly, nor the doctrine of purgatory to the cleansing of which the Romish Church affirms subjected all who reach the other world without being wholly purified, and further maintains, that the stay in it may be shortened by the performance of many good works in this life and even after death by the performance of good works and prayers for the dead on the part of survivors. Gerlach cites a passage from John Damasc., in which the doctrine of the ancient Church on the subject of Christ's descent into hell is summed up as follows: "His glorified soul descends into Hades in order that like as the Sun of righteousness did rise to men on earth, so in like manner He might shine on those who under the earth sit in darkness and in the shadow of death; in order that as He did publish peace to men on earth, gave deliverance to the captives and sight to the blind, and became the Cause of eternal salvation to believers, while He convicted the disobedient of unbelief, so in like manner He might deal with the inhabitants of Hades, so that to Him every knee should bow of those who are in heaven, on earth and under the earth, and that having thus loosed the chains of those long-confined prisoners, He might return from the dead and prepare to us the way of the resurrection." The divine truths contained in this passage may be abused against the cause of missions and the necessity of a holy life; but abuse does not cancel the right use.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Christian's best armour against the assaults of suffering is the believing, obedient and submissive mind of suffering in which Christ accepted His suffering as a cup tendered by the paternal hand of God.—God's chief design in sending suffering is to withdraw us from sin and the lusts of men up to Himself.—Sufferings under persecution and abuse are a means of purifying and refining.—Which are the dangers against which we ought to be especially armed under persecutions for righteousness' sake?—Consider the comforting fact that Christ has suffered in the flesh for you. Look, 1. at His person; 2. at the greatness of His suffering in the flesh; 3. at His suffering for you; 4. at the result of it.—Preservatives against relapsing into heathenish ways: 1. the communion with and conformity to Christ; 2. frequent reflection on your former sinful condition; 3. the abuse of unbelievers; 4. the nearness of the impending account to be rendered; 5. prayer; 6. continuance in the communion of love with the brethren; 7. the founding of all your actions on the word and strength of God.—The unhappy consistency in the service of sin.—Will you continue in the service of sin, although Christ came to save you?—The appearing of Christ among the dead is both the last degree of His condescension and the turning-point of His exaltation.—The mercy of God extends even to the judgment-prison of the realms of death.—Who will preach to the untold thousands, who after Christ's descent into Hades have been born and have died without a knowledge of the Gospel?—Why should that fact not check, but rather strengthen missionary zeal?

Starke:—Shall the disciple be greater than his master, and the servant greater than his Lord? Be content, if in the world it fares with you as with your Saviour, it is enough that you shall be like Him in heaven. Matt. x. 24. 25.—Will you fret at sufferings and tribulations? If you knew the wholesomeness of this cup, you would joyfully empty it, Ezek. ii. 6.—The beloved cross is like strong salt: as the latter prevents corruption, so does the cross prevent the corruption of the flesh, Ps. cxix. 71.—Sin at a standstill is the well-being of sinners, continuance in sin the strongest barrier against grace, the best repentance is never to sin.—Christianity renders the best service to the commonwealth, in that it most earnestly forbids the vices which are most dangerous to it.—The children of the world grieve most at your separating from their communion; by that they consider themselves put to shame and despised. Haughtiness and venomous malice are the sources of their abuse.—The remembrance of the last day and its judgment ought to be to us a constant sermon on repentance, Eccl. xii. 13. 14; 2 Cor. v. 10.

LISCO:—The blessed effect of suffering.—The Lord's miracles of grace in His kingdom. The sufferings of Christ present us with a strong motive to arm ourselves with His mind.

[PYTHAGORAS:—VER. 1. *Summa religionis imitari quem colis.*—M.]

[LEIGHTON:—Love desires nothing more than likeness, and shares willingly in all with the party loved; and above all love, this Divine love is purest and highest and works most strongly that way, takes pleasure in that pain, and is a voluntary death, as Plato calls love.—M.]

[ATTERBURY:—"Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, let us arm ourselves with the same mind," with a resolution to imitate Him in His perfect submission and resignation of Himself to the Divine will and pleasure; in His contempt of all the enjoyments of sense, of all the vanities of this world, its allurements and terrors; in His practice of religious severities; in His love of religious retirement; in making it His meat and drink, His only study and delight, "to work the work of Him that sent Him"; in His choosing for that end, when that end could not otherwise be obtained, want before abundance, shame before honour, pain before pleasure, death before life; and in His preferring always a laborious uninterrupted practice of virtue to a life of rest and ease and indolence.—M.]

[BENGEL:—VER. 2. "βιῶσαι. *Aptum verbum; non dicitur de brutis.*"—M.]

[AUGUSTINE:—*Perdit quod vivit, qui te Deum non diligit; qui curat vivere, non propter te, Domine, nihil est et pro nihilo est; qui tibi vivere recusat mortuus est; qui tibi non sapit, desipit.*—M.]

[LEIGHTON:—Politic men have observed, that in states, if alterations must be, it is better to alter many things than a few. And physicians have the same remark for one's habit and custom for bodily health upon the same ground, because things do so relate one to another, that except they be adapted and suited together in the change, it avails not; yea, it sometimes proves the worse in the whole, though a few things in particular seem to be bettered. Thus, half reformations in a Christian, turn to his prejudice; it is only best to be thoroughly reformed, and to give up with all idols; not to live one half to himself and the world and, as it were, another half to God; for that is but falsely so and in reality it cannot be. The only way is to make a heap of all, to have all sacrificed together, and to live to no lust, but altogether and only to God.—M.]

[Illustration of verses 3 and 4. The poet says of the orgies of Bacchus:—

> "*Turba ruunt; mixtæque viris, matresque nurusque*
> *Vulgusque, proceresque ignota ad sacra feruntur*
> *Quis furor—*
> *Feminex voces, et mota insania vino*
> *Obscenique greges, et inania tympana.*"
>
> OVID, Met. 3, 529, etc.—M.]

CHAPTER IV. 7–11.

ANALYSIS:—Exhortation, in contemplation of the approaching end of all things, to watch and pray, to love and to do, to serve others with the gifts they have received, and in a word to seek in everything the glory of God.

7 But the end of all things is at hand: [1]be ye therefore sober, and watch unto
8 prayer.[2] And above all things have fervent charity among [3]yourselves: for charity
9 shall cover[4] the multitude of sins. Use hospitality[5] one to another[6] without grudging.
10 [7]As every man hath received the gift, *even so* minister the same one to another, as good
11 stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak, *let him speak* as the oracles
of God; if any man minister, *let him do it* as of the ability[8] which God giveth; that
God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ: to whom be [9]praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.[10]

Verse 7. [[1] σωφρονήσατε=be temperate, of a temperate mind; νήψατε=be sober.—M.]
[[2] εἰς τὰς προσευχάς; (τάς is omitted in A. B. and by Lachmann;) also in Cod. Sin.—M.]
Verse 8. [[3] Translate: "Above all things having love intense towards one another;" on ἐκτενῆ see ch. i. 22.—M.]
[[4] καλύπτει, A. B. K. Lachmann and Tischendorf, also Alford: καλύψει L. Receptus, is the more difficult reading.—ἀγάπη=love.—M.]
Verse 9. [[5] φιλόξενοι=hospitable.—M.]
[[6] ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ, A. B., Cod. Sinait., Lachm., Tisch., Alford. γογγυσμῶν, Rec. K. L. Translate: "without murmuring," so German.—M.]
Verse 10. [[7] Translate: "Each man, as he has received a gift of grace."—M.]
Verse 11. [[8] ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεός="as out of the power which God bestoweth," so German, Van Ess, Allioli and others.—M.]
[[9] ἐστιν=*is*, not *be*.—M.]
[10] Translate: "To whom is the glory and the power (or might) to the ages of the ages. Amen."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 7. The connection is with ver. 5; the Apostle takes up and further enforces the thought that the Lord is ready to judge the living and the dead; here begins also a new series of exhortations closely connected with the thought of the end of all things. It has been shown that Peter in common with the other Apostles, Jas. v. 7. 8. 9; Jude 18; 1 Jno. ii. 18; Rev. i. 3; xxii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rom. xiii. 11. 12; 1 Cor. xv

51; 2 Cor. v. 2; Phil. iv. 5, expected that the second advent of Christ and the end of the whole present dispensation were nearly impending, cf. ch. i. 5; iv. 5. 17. 18; i. 7; v. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 10. 11; Mtt. xxiv. 6. This may be accounted for by the fact that the coming of Christ in the flesh is the beginning of the world's last period, during which no further revelation of grace is to be expected; and that according to the mind of Jesus, His disciples ought to consider His second coming as always close at hand, and to be prepared for it. "It ought to be the chief concern of believers to fix their minds fully on His second advent." Calvin. "We live in the latter half of the world's period, which will quickly flow on. Although we may not live to see it, after death we shall realize that we are near it." Roos. It is however to be remembered that nothing but the long-suffering of God is arresting the judgment, and that He is counting by the measure of eternity, according to which a thousand years are as one day (2 Pet. iii. 8; Ps. xc. 4). [The emphasis of πάντων is noteworthy. Bengel; "*Finis adeoque etiam petulantiæ malorum et passionum piorum.*"—M.]

Be temperate therefore and sober unto prayers.—As our Lord in contemplation of His day exhorts the disciples, Lke. xxi. 34, "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life," so the Apostle here exhorts us to σωφρονεῖν=to act wisely, to be temperate and modest. It primarily denotes bodily temperance, then mental discretion and watchfulness, cf. ch. v. 8; Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 13; Tit. ii. 6.—νήφειν=to live soberly, moderately both bodily and mentally as in ch. i. 13. "Temperance facilitates vigilance, and both aid prayer." Bengel.—εἰς τὰς προσευχάς, the Plural, because, as Huss remarks, there are different kinds of prayer and because prayer ought to be without ceasing. The reference is probably to fixed, regular prayers of the Church.

Ver. 8. Then follows the still more important exhortation to brotherly love according to its real nature, cf. on ἐκτενῆ ch. i. 22; 1 Cor. xiii. 1, etc.; xiv. 1. It is the mother of all the duties to our neighbour. Where love is wanting, prayer is hindered.

Because love covereth a multitude of sins.—καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν. The words are cited from the Hebrew not from the LXX. of Prov. x. 12, cf. ch. xvii. 9, but the former passage reads: "Hatred stirreth up strifes, but love covereth all sins"; and the latter: "He that covereth transgression, seeketh love." In both instances the reference is to human love which is to consign to oblivion the sins of others. Some see in כִּסָּה a reference to Gen. ix. 23, and consider it an easy thing; so Cæsarius of Arles says: "There is nothing more easy than covering oneself or others with clothes." But forgiveness is hardly so easy a task. It is better to explain it of the unsightliness of sin which forgiveness covers up. The old Protestant expositors understand it therefore rightly of human love pardoning the sin of our neighbour. "The covering up relates to man not to God. Nothing can cover thy sin before God except faith. But my love covers my neighbour's sin, and just as God covers my sin if I believe, so ought I also to cover the sin of my neighbour." Luther. So also Steiger, Hoffman, Lechler, Wiesinger and Weiss. Even Estius, the Romish expositor, admits that the quotation sustains the Protestant exposition. But many Romanist and rationalistic expositors explain the passage of merit and atoning virtue, which they ascribe to the love of our neighbour. Some quote Matt. vi. 14. 15, but that passage simply affirms that forgiveness is made possible, not that it is positively effected. Others, with reference to Jas. v. 20, suggest an activity tending to improvement [that of others, —M.], but this is foreign to our passage. ὅτι seems however to conflict with our exposition, but its design is to give the reason for the ἐκτένεια of love. "The Apostle takes for granted that Christians love one another, still he recommends them to expand and increase in the brotherly love which they have, because true love forgives a multitude of sins." 1 Cor. xiii. 4–7; Matt. xviii. 22. Steiger. According to Beza the connection is: "Love one another, because love, as the Scripture says, removes the substance of strife." Calov remarks on this covering of sin, that it does not do away with the correcting of our neighbour, Matt. xviii. 15, and that it is necessary to distinguish public and private sins, between known and concealed sins. [Alford thinks that the meaning is the hiding of offences both from one another and in God's sight, by mutual forbearance and forgiveness. He advocates to take the passage in its widest sense, "understanding it primarily of forgiveness but then also of that prevention of sin by kindliness of word and deed, and also that intercession for sin in prayer, which are the constant fruits of fervent love. It is a truth from which we need not shrink, that every sin which love hides from man's sight is hidden in God's sight also. There is but One efficient cause of the hiding of sin: but mutual love *applies* that cause: *draws the universal cover over the particular sin.* This meaning, as long as it is not perverted into the thought that love towards others covers a man's own sin '*ex promerito*' need not and should not be excluded."—M.]

[Wordsworth: "St. Peter had spoken of love, *stretching itself* out without interruption; and the passage James v. 20, considered together with the context here, where St. Peter is presenting Christ as their Example, may suggest a belief, that he is comparing the act of Love to that of the Cherubim *stretching out* their wings on the Mercy Seat, and forming a part of the Mercy Seat (Ex. xxv. 18–20), the emblem of Christ's propitiatory *covering of sins.*"—M.]

Ver. 9. **Be hospitable towards one another without murmuring.**—Cf. Rom. xii. 13; Heb. xiii. 2; 3 Jno. 5; 1 Tim. v. 10; Tit. i. 8. "Peter remembers to have heard this saying from the lips of Christ, Matt. xxv. 35; he does not mean pompous hospitality, Lke. xiv. 12, but that Christian, holy hospitality which readily welcomes by the promptings of pure love needy strangers, especially such as are exiled on account of their confession of the true religion, gives them gentle and loving treatment, and cares for them as members of Christ and fellow-citi-

zens of the Church." Gerhard. "Let us take heed lest, having been hard and careless in entertaining strangers, the shelter of the just may be denied us after this life." Ambrose.—ἄνευ γογγυσμῶν, without expressions of murmuring by which one secretly gives vent to his displeasure or reproaches another with the benefits he has received. The opposite is a cheerful, pure and unselfish spirit, Rom. xii. 8; 2 Cor. ix. 7. [Neander *Ch. Hist.* I. pp. 347. 348, referring to Tertullian, *ad uxorem*, II. 1. 8.; *de jejunio*, c. XII: "The care of providing for the support and maintenance of strangers, of the poor, the sick, the old, of widows and orphans, and of those in prison on account of their faith, devolved on the whole Church. This was one of the main purposes for which the collection of voluntary contributions, in the assemblies convened for public worship, was instituted; and the charity of individuals, moreover, led them to emulate each other in the same good work. In particular, it was considered as belonging to the office of the Christian matron to provide for the poor, for the brethren languishing in prison, and to show hospitality to strangers. The hindrance occasioned to this kind of Christian activity, is reckoned by Tertullian among the disadvantages of a mixed marriage. 'What heathen,' says he, 'will suffer his wife to go about from one street to another, to the house of strangers, to the meanest hovels indeed, for the purpose of visiting the brethren? What heathen will allow her to steal away into the dungeon, to kiss the chain of the martyr? If a brother arrive from abroad, what reception will he meet in the house of *the stranger?* If an alms is to be bestowed, storehouse and cellar are shut fast!' On the other hand, he counts it among the felicities of a marriage contracted between Christians, that the wife is at liberty to visit the sick and relieve the needy, and is never straitened or perplexed in the bestowment of her charities. Nor did the active brotherly love of each community confine itself to what transpired in its own immediate circle, but extended itself also to the wants of Christian communities in distant lands. On urgent occasions of this kind, the bishops made arrangements for special collections. They appointed fasts; so that what was saved, even by the poorest of the flock, from their daily food, might help to supply the common wants."—M.]

VER. 10. **Each man, as he received a gift of grace.**—Grotius rightly expounds this not only of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 4, etc., but also of gifts of the body and estate. These are as well gifts of grace as those. Natural endowments also are included in the expression. The Apostle does not refer to specific official duties and the qualifications necessary to their discharge; he is unwilling to exact too much from and to impose too much on believers.

Even so minister to one another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.—αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες, cf. ch. i. 12, to offer something as a servant. The term comprises the different duties of the Church which are not specifically committed to the pastoral office as such, and which are the outgoings of voluntary activity.

As good stewards.—ὡς denotes not only mere resemblance, but, as frequently, the generally known reason [as is becoming, fit in good stewards.—M.]. Christians are not owners, but only stewards of their goods and gifts, 1 Cor. iv. 2; Matt. xxv. 14; Tit. i. 7.—**Manifold,** because exhibited in various gifts of grace [cf. 1 Cor. xii. 4; Matt. xxv. 15. Lke. xix. 13.—M.]. "We are liberal not with our own goods, but with that of another." Gerhard.

VER. 11. **If any man speak - - as of the power which God bestoweth.**—Peter specifies two kinds of gifts, gifts relating to speaking and gifts relating to doing, gifts of teaching and exhorting, and gifts of outward service.—These gifts they were to use with humility and fidelity. λαλεῖν here denotes every kind of speaking and exhortation in the Lord's name, Rom. xii. 6–8; 1 Cor. xii. 8. 10.—λόγια properly signifies Divine utterances, oracles, but here the revealed word of God, 1 Cor. ii. 7; Acts vii. 38; Heb. v. 12; Rom. iii. 2. Let him speak with the conviction and reverence, with the earnestness and humility which flow from the consciousness: it is God's holy word to which, as a mean instrument, I lend my mouth, 1 Cor. xii. 3; 2 Cor. ii. 17; 1 Thess. ii. 13.—διακονεῖ applies here to the manifold offices belonging to the single or married estate, Acts vi. 1, 2. [But see Rom. xii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28. —M.] ἰσχύς the act springs from the power of God [as from a fountain.—M.] which He supplies. The term relates to powers of the body as well as to those of the mind. χορηγεῖν=παρέχειν, διδόναι. [The primary sense and origin of the word is Classical, and denotes "to defray the cost of bringing out a chorus", thence to furnish supply in general.—M.]. "Let each man apply to his neighbour all the good in his power with the utmost humility, knowing that of himself [*i. e.*, without God's supplying.—M.] he cannot have any thing to apply." [Wordsworth: This precept of St. Peter deserves the consideration of those who claim to be his successors, and profess great reverence for his authority, and yet derogate from the dignity of the *oracles of God*, and set up oracles of their own, in place of the Scriptures and against them. See 2 Tim. iv. 3. Rev. xi. 3–10.—M.]. Bede.

That God in all things—to the ages of the ages.—ἵνα, the aim and end of all the Apostle's exhortations.—ἐν πᾶσι may mean, in all of you or in all your doings; the latter is preferable. "As through Christ all benefits descend upon us from God, so also ought we in humble gratitude to refer all things through Christ to the glory of God." Gerhard. δοξάζηται, the honour should be ascribed to Him for whatever is done in the Church, He should be praised for it, cf. Heb. xiii. 15. Everything is mediated through Christ, through whom we receive all the power we have.—ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα; ᾧ refers to ὁ Θεός as in ch. v. 11, because God has already been named as the subject of adoration, and because Peter elsewhere calls Jesus κύριος=Jehovah, but not absolutely God.—On δόξα see ch. i. 7.—κράτος goes back to ἰσχύς. All power among men is the emanation of His power, cf. ch. v. 11.—εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, cf. Phil. iv. 20.—ἀμήν, not a note of conclusion, but an expression of assurance of heart.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The doctrine of the consummation of all things on the coming of Christ, which is peculiarly prominent in the writings of Peter, contains the most powerful reasons for our encouragement and consolation. They make no mention of the distinction between the first and still impending coming for the establishment of the kingdom of glory and the judgment of a corrupt Christendom and the coming for the final judgment: that distinction was reserved for special revelations made to St. John.

2. The love covering sins, which is here so emphatically recommended, is widely removed from the laxity, weakness and want of principle with which it is frequently confounded. The latter, says Wiesinger, ignores the sacred earnestness of love and fancies to do some great thing by putting some deceptive boards over graves full of mouldering decay and crying, Peace, peace! Hatred which unsparingly uncovers in its effects is preferable to love which thus covers up. The love here insisted upon has these characteristics, it is not put to anger by insults, it does not discover needlessly the sins of others and does not by revenge or passionate reproaches drag them forth into the light of rebuke.

3. The opinion that the love of our neighbour covers our sins before God conflicts with the fundamental principles of the Gospel; it is not the cause, but only one of the conditions on which we are made partakers of Divine forgiveness, Mtt. vi. 14.

4. With respect to God, we are stewards of goods committed to our keeping, with respect to our neighbour only we are owners.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The end of all things, how it should minister to, 1, encouragement, 2, warning, 3, consolation.—Whatsoever thou takest in hand, remember the end, Sir. vii. 36.—If Peter more than eighteen centuries ago was permitted to say the end of all things was at hand, how much more ought we to be prepared, to watch and pray. We should ever consider the great day of Christ to be near at hand. Believers wait for it as a bridegroom waits for his bride. The end of the way and the nearness of home is sweet and comforting to strangers and pilgrims.—Communion with God, the most precious enjoyment of earth, is only possible to those who are temperate and sober.—He that ministers to sensuality cannot soar in thought to God.—Love should be like fire which spreads its flame afar, and like a cloak which covers much. "That godly father would not shut his door to any poor guest, for I am afraid, said he, lest the Lord Himself might some day come, in the guise of a poor man, to test my liberality: how could I ever justify my having suffered Him sadly to depart from me?"

Besser: There is none so poor as to be unable to serve his neighbour with some gift.—God distributes His gifts unequally, Mtt. xxv. 15. Moses has five talents, Aaron two, Jethro only one. Let each use his gifts to the glory of God, and he will stand before God and men.

Herberger: The Christian's motto: Faithful and only faithful!—A Christian's any and every work, should be a Divine service and conduce to the glory of God.

Starke: Men, beware of confidence! be ready that you may be able to stand worthily before the Son of Man, 2 Pet. iii. 11.—Love has the first place among all virtues and is the first mark of the disciples of Christ, 1 Cor. xiii. 13; Jno. xiii. 35.—To give unwillingly and regretfully is to sin more than to do good, 2 Cor. ix. 7.—As among flowers the form and beauty of each differ from those of others, so among the children of God is seen the manifold goodness of God.—God has given to one something, but not everything, that we might serve one another, and that none should bury his talent, Gal. v. 13.—Are graces and gifts thine own? Who has granted them to thee? God. To what end? To parade them off? By no means, but to serve Him and thy neighbour with them. Love makes thee thy neighbour's servant. The more thou hast received, the more thou hast to communicate in counsel and in deed, 1 Cor. ix. 19.—If thou hast nothing wherewith to serve thy neighbour, thou surely canst pray for him. Discharge this service of love with hearty cheerfulness; it is, if not better than, at least as good as pieces of gold, Rom. x. 1; Acts iii. 6. [But prayer—instead of ministering to the wants of the needy—where the ability is present and the occasion requires it—is sheer hypocrisy.—M.]. The glory of God should be the end and aim of all our works, otherwise they are good for nothing, 1 Cor. x. 31.

Lisco: What does qualify us to receive the gifts of the Holy Ghost?—The conditions of real prayer.

Herberger: How should a good Christian, who desires to go to heaven acquit himself, 1, towards God, 2, towards his neighbour, 3, with respect to his own conscience, soul and office?

Stier: How Christians ought to prepare for the end of all things, or how we must live here in time in order that we may stand in the last judgment?

Kapff: Spiritual ascension, 1, By whom and how it is accomplished, 2, What are its effects on our earthly life?

Staudt: Christian mutual readiness to oblige, 1, its ability, 2, its opportunities, 3, the condition necessary for its discharge.

[Leighton:—Ver. 7. It is reported of one that, hearing the 5th of Genesis read *so long lived*, and yet the burden still, *they died;* Enos lived 905 and he died, Seth 912 and he died, Methusaleh 969 and he died, he took so deep the thought of death and eternity, that it changed his whole frame and set him from a voluptuous to a most strict and pious course of life.

Ver. 8. Love is witty in finding out the fairest construction of things doubtful.—Where the thing is so plainly a sin, that this way of covering it can have no place, yet then will love consider what will lessen it most.—All private reproofs and where conscience requires public delation and censure, even these will be sweetened in that compassion that flows from love.—If thou be interested in the offence, even by unfeigned free forgiveness, so far as thy concern goes, let it be as if it had not been.

Ver. 9. Now for supply of our brethren's necessities, one good help is, the retrenching of our superfluities. Turn the stream into that channel, where it will refresh thy brethren and enrich thyself, and let it not run into the dead sea.—As the disease of the youth of the world, was the *abounding of lust*, Gen. vi, so of its age, *decay of love:* and as that heat called for a total deluge of waters, to this coldness for fire, to the kindling an universal fire, that shall make an end of it and the world together. (*Aqua propter ardorem libidinis, ignis propter teporem charitatis.*)

Ver. 10. *Manifold grace.*—There is such an admirable beauty in this variety, such a symmetry and contemperature of different, yea of contrary qualities, as speaks His riches, that so divers gifts are from the same Spirit. A kind of embroidering of many colours (see Ps. cxxxix. 15) happily mixed, as the word ποικίλλειν signifies; as it is in the frame of the natural body of man as the lesser world, and in the composure of the greater world: thus in the Church of God, the mystical body of Jesus Christ exceeding both the former in excellence and beauty.—Be not discouraged, to have little in the account shall be no prejudice. The approbation runs not, *thou hadst much*, but on the contrary, *thou hast been faithful in little;* great faithfulness in the use of small gifts hath great acceptance, and a great and sure reward.

Ver. 11. Ministers must speak faithfully, holily and wisely.—Faith's great work is to renounce self-power and to bring in the power of God to be ours . . . When I am weak, then am I strong, 2 Cor. xii. 10.—This is the Christian's aim, to have nothing in himself, nor in anything but in this tenure: all for the glory of my God, my estate, family, abilities, my whole self, all I have and am. And as the love of God grows in the heart, this purpose grows; the higher the flame rises, the purer it is; the eye is daily more upon it; it is oftener in the mind in all actions than before. In common things, the very works of our calling, our very refreshments, to eat and drink and sleep, all are for this end and with a particular aim at it as much as may be; even the thought of it often renewed throughout the day, and at times generally applied to all our ways and employments. It is that elixir that turns thy ordinary works into gold, into sacrifices, by a touch of it.—M.]

CHAPTER IV. 12–19.

Analysis:—Further exhortation to readiness of suffering and becoming conduct in suffering. They are to consider suffering as inseparable from following Christ, as necessary to their trial, and instrumental toward their future glory, as rendering them partakers of the power of the Spirit, and as delivering them from the last judgment. But they should never lose sight of maintaining their difference from unbelievers.

12 Beloved, [1] think it not strange concerning [2] the fiery trial which is to try you, [3] as
13 though some strange thing [4] happened unto you: But rejoice, [5] inasmuch as ye are par-
takers[6] of Christ's sufferings; [7] that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad
14 also [8] with exceeding joy. [9] If ye be reproached for [10] the name of Christ, happy[11]
are ye; [12] for the Spirit of glory and [13] of God resteth upon you: [14] on their part he is
15 evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified. [15] But let none of you suffer as a mur-
16 derer, or *as* a thief, or *as* an evil doer, or as a [16] busybody in other men's matters. Yet
if *any man suffer* as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God
17 [17] on this behalf. [18] For the time *is come* that judgment must begin at the house of
God: [19] and if *it* first *begin* at us, what shall the end *be* of them that obey not the gos-
18 pel of God? And if the righteous [20] scarcely be saved[21], where shall the ungodly and
19 the sinner appear? Wherefore, [22] let them that suffer according to the will of God
commit the keeping of their souls *to him* in well doing, [23] as unto a faithful Creator.[24]

Verse 12. [1 μὴ ξενίζεσθε, Pass., see v. 4, "be not astonished at." On the construction of this Verb with the Dative, see Winer, p. 222.—M.]
[2 πύρωσις, literally, *burning*, figuratively, *trial by fire;* the rendering of E. V. must be regarded as very felicitous. πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένῃ=which is taking place among you (or as Alford renders, "in your case") for a trial to you.—M.]
[3 ὡς=as if.—M.]
[4 ξένου συμβαίνοντος ὑμῖν="some strange thing were happening to you.—M.]
Verse 13. [5 καθὸ is supported by A. B. K. L., Rec. and many others; καθὼς, a less authentic reading; translate "in as far as," (Alford) or "in the degree to which" (German); cf. Rom. viii. 26; 2 Cor. viii. 12.—M.]
[6 κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς κ. τ. λ.="ye are partakers with the sufferings of Christ."—M.]
[7 Translate, "In order that ye may also at (=in) the revelation of his glory rejoice."—M.]
[8 ἀγαλλιώμενοι=exulting, Participle.—M.]
Verse 14. [9 "If ye *are* reproached," εἰ with Indicative.—M.]
[10 ἐν ὀνόματι=in the name of Christ, cf. Matt. v. 11; ch. iii. 14.—M.]
[11 μακάριοι=blessed are ye.—M.]
[12 ὅτι=because, it gives the reason why they are blessed.—M.]

[13 On the Article with attributives, see Winer, p. 144. Translate: "the Spirit of glory, and that of God"—"the Spirit of Glory, who is none else than God's Spirit Himself." For classical illustrations, see Winer.—M.]

[A. (Griesbach, Scholz and Lachmann insert after δόξης, καὶ δυνάμεως); so Sinait.; but (Tischendorf rejects the addition).—M.]

[14 κατὰ μὲν αὐτοὺς βλασφημεῖται, κατὰ δὲ ὑμᾶς δοξάζεται. This clause stands in Recept., K. L. and others,] but is wanting in A. B., Sinaitic. and many MSS. Lachmann and Tischendorf, also Alford reject it. [It is in all probability a gloss.—M.]

Verse 15. [15 γὰρ=for.—M.]

[16 ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος, a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, denoting "overseeing other people's affairs, prying into them." Alford: "Pryer into other men's matters." De Wette: "an impertinent;" but see note below.—M.]

Verse 16. [17 ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τουτῷ. Rec. reads μέρει instead of ὀνόματι, with K. L.; but the former reading has more weighty authorities, and is sustained by Lachmann, Tischendorf and Alford. Translate: "in this name," *i. e.*, the name of χριστιανός.—M.]

Verse 17. [18 ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς=because it is the season, Alford; (because) it is time, German.—M.]

[19 Translate: "of the judgment beginning at the house of God, but if (it begin) first at us, what (will be) the end of them that are disobedient to the Gospel of God?"—M.]

Verse 18. [20 μόλις=with difficulty, hardly (German).—M.]

[21 σώζεται=is saved. Translate, to bring out the force of the Greek: "the ungodly and the sinner where shall he appear?" Alford.—M.]

Verse 19. [22 ὥστε καὶ κ. τ. λ.=wherefore let also them who suffer, etc.—M.]

23 Tischendorf reads ἀγαθοποιΐᾳ, a more authentic reading than ἀγαθοποιΐαις.

24 ὡς is omitted in A. B., Sinait., and by Lachmann [and Alford; it is inserted in Rec., with K. L. and others.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The exhortations to readiness of suffering are repeated, but urged on different grounds.

VER. 12. **Beloved.**—This address, as in ch. ii. 11, denotes the Apostle's heart-felt sympathy with them in the sufferings concerning which he is consoling them.

Be not astonished at.—"If the heathen think the behaviour of Christians strange, Christians need not be surprised if unbelievers persecute them on that account," ch. i. 7, Steiger.—τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει. πύρωσις=burning, ignition, kindling, fire while burning, from πυροῦμαι, 2 Pet. iii. 12; Rev. xviii. 9; Prov. xxvii. 21; LXX. Zech. xiii. 9. It is a simile of great tribulations, which burn like fire, but conduce to proof.—[Cf. also Ps. lxvi. 10 in LXX. Oecumenius says, πύρωσιν τὰς θλίψεις εἰπών, ἐνέφηνεν ὡς διὰ δοκιμασίαν αὐτοῖς αὗται,—M.] 'ἐν ὑμῖν may mean "which you feel within yourselves," better, "which is among you."—"As the potter or the goldsmith adjusts the furnace to the earthen vessel or to the gold, so that it be neither too hot nor too cold, so God adjusts temptation (trial) to the strength of man and to the grace which He grants him, and suffers him not to be tempted beyond his ability to bear." Ephrem.—πρὸς πειρασμόν, cf. ch. i. 7; Jas. i. 2. Not unto perdition, but unto salvation. Even this moderates the pain of the heat.—ὡς ξένου.—Perhaps you consider the suffering accidental, interfering with God's purpose concerning you, and putting you back in your Christianity, but know that it has been decreed from all eternity, it has been repeatedly foretold in the Scriptures, it has been the common experience of all believers from the beginning, and it is absolutely necessary for the mortification of the old man. "That cannot be displeasing which is dealt by the hand of a friend." Gerhard.

VER. 13. **In as far as ye are partakers with the sufferings of Christ.**—καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε.—It is a great consolation that the believer is permitted to consider his sufferings as a partaking with the sufferings of Christ; but it is a greater consolation that he is permitted to infer his communion with the glory of Christ from his communion with His sufferings. καθὸ denotes, at once the reason and the measure of the sufferings.

The sufferings of Christ, as in ch. i. 11; cf. ch. ii. 21; iii. 18, not such as affect Him in His members, but such as He Himself endured in the days of His incarnation. Christians partake with them, if, for the sake of truth and righteousness, their experience of the world's sin is similar to that of Christ. They are in Christ, and the hatred shown to them is really shown to Him, cf. Rom. viii. 17. 29; 2 Tim. ii. 11.

That ye may also at the revelation of His glory rejoice, exulting.—ἵνα καί, otherwise the day of the revelation of Christ would be to you a day of terror.—καί, as you now rejoice already in hope.—τῆς δόξης, in contrast with the darkness of suffering, ch. i. 5. 7. 11.—χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι, cf. ch. i. 8. "The joy of the saints will be inward and outward, bodily and spiritual." Huss. The connection is, as given by Weiss: Only he who suffers with Christ and for His cause, is a true disciple of Christ. Such an one may cherish the expectation of the heavenly reward of partaking with His glory, even as Christ has promised again and again, Matt. x. 38. 39; xvi. 24. 25; Lke. ix. 23. 24; xiv. 27; Jno. xii. 26; xiv. 3; xvii. 24; Matt. v. 12; Lke. vi. 22. 23. The real life-communion with Christ, as we find it described in the writings of Paul, is not affirmed here.

VER. 14. **If ye are reproached in** (German, *for*) **the name of Christ.**—ἐν ὀνόματι. ὄνομα, often like שֵׁם =revealed being (revelation of the being, *i. e.*, nature and existence). Jno. xvii. 6. 26; i. 12; Acts iii. 16; iv. 12; Heb. ii. 12, also=order, command. Here in its proper sense =the name and whatever it involves. Mk. ix. 41 contains the best key to the exposition. The passage reads: "For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." As the benefactions of others may be the result of their belonging to Christ, so it may be with their hatred. They reproach you because you confess, call upon and bear the name of Christ, which they hate, cf. v. 16. ὡς χριστιανός, and Matt. v. 11; Lke. vi. 22. Christ is to the world a hateful name; if one preaches it, he must suffer. The reproaches cast at their persons and conversation probably proceeded from unbelieving Jews, who blasphemed the name of Christ, Jas. ii. 7.

Blessed are ye—resteth upon you.—*μακάριοι*, cf. ch. iii. 14. Their state of bliss is inferred from the glory already existing, although invisible to ordinary eyes. *τὸ τῆς δόξης*—Spirit of glory denotes the Holy Spirit, because, as Calov explains it, He brings glory and seals it in suffering. This Spirit being given to you with the communion of Christ, you are even now, by faith and hope, partakers of future glory, you anticipate it in the Spirit, and therefore you are blessed, cf. ch. i. 8. Hence Paul, in the further development of this thought, called the Spirit the earnest of the inheritance, Eph. i. 14.—*καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, this second predicate is added by way of explanation. It is not the spirit of Elijah, or of an angel, but the Spirit of God. "This is to the Apostle so great and so blessed a thing, that though the world is against them, God is for them, as their shield and exceeding great reward." Wiesinger. *ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται.*—The reference appears to be to Is. xi. 2; cf. 2 Kings ii. 15. Lke. x. 6. *ἐπί*, with the Accus., denotes the descent of the Spirit on them.—*ἀναπαύεσθαι*, according to Olshausen, contains the idea of an abiding that cannot be overthrown, even by doubts and temptations. It is cognizable to those whose spiritual vision has been rendered acute, and is evinced chiefly in a meek spirit of suffering.

[Wordsworth:—"The *glory* and *happiness* of *suffering* for God in the *fire* of *persecution* might also well occur to his mind at *Babylon*, where he is writing, and where he would be cheered by a remembrance of the three faithful children walking unhurt in *the fiery furnace* with the Son of God. (Dan. iii. 1-25.)"—M.]

On their part—glorified.—[See note 14 in Appar. Critic.—M.] With and among them, the children of the world, as is their nature and wont, He is evil spoken of; they traduce the spirit of suffering as a degrading and slavish spirit, and humility as cowardice. These invectives fall back on the Spirit Himself.—Others connect *βλασφημεῖται* with *ὄνομα χριστοῦ*, which is rather a forced construction. Among you it is glorified by the consolations, the quietness and peace which it brings to you; thus it evinces its Divine power, and excites your praise and gratitude. The passage gives a good sense, and it would be a pity if it were spurious [as the authorities declare it to be.—M.]

VER. 15. **For let none of you—pryer into other men's matters.**—Here the Apostle takes up the preceding blessedness (*μακάριοι*, v. 14), and in the form of exhortation emphatically declares that the value of such patient suffering depends on the condition that those who endure it must be innocent sufferers, ch. ii. 20; iii. 17. This is expressed first negatively, then positively. Here is an evident allusion to Matt. v. 11, "if they say all manner of evil against you falsely (lying)."—*ὡς φονεύς.*—The reference is not to real accusations which had been brought against them, but to the possibility that such offences might occur among them, as Paul warns the Ephesians against stealing, Eph. iv. 28.—*κακοποιός*, cf. ch. ii. 12. 14; iii. 16. 17, in a general, moral sense, not as denoting political offences, as if this had been the official description of Christians, according to Suetonius, *Vita Neronis*, c. 16, which cannot be proved. See Weiss, p. 367.—*ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος*, a term unknown to the Greeks. It denotes one arrogating to himself the oversight of matters with which he has no concern. Such indiscreet zeal is not uncommon, as Hottinger remarks, among new religious communities. This may have been a frequent temptation to the primitive Christians, owing to their consciousness of more enlightened views. It is more than *περιεργάζεσθαι*, 2 Thess. iii. 11. Cyprian: *alienas curas agens*, cf. 1 Tim. v. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 11; Lke. xii. 14. [*ὁ επισκεπτόμενος τὰ ἀλλότρια. Hanc explicationem probat* 1, *ipsa vocis compositio* 2, *veterum expositio, Tert. Cypr. Aug.* 3, *temporis et loci circumstantia. Procul dubio quidam Christiani, ex incogitantia, temeritate et levitate, in actiones infidelium utpote vicinorum suorum curiosius inquirebant, eas propria arbitrio redarguebant ac judices eorum esse volebant, quod non pertinebat ad eorum vocationem.* Gerhard.—M.]

VER. 16. **But if** (he suffer) **as a Christian.**—The name *Christian* appears at that time to have been adopted by believers, Acts xi. 26; xxvi. 28. In the opinion of their enemies, the name was infamous, and so we must understand it here, cf. v. 14. With the Jews it was tantamount to sectary, renegade and rebel; with the heathen it was equal to atheist.

Let him not be ashamed.—Cf. Rom. i. 16: 2 Tim. i. 8. 12. Such sufferings conduce not to shame, but to honour; "they are precious jewels in the sight of God." Calov. Acts v. 41.

But let him glorify God in this part.—"On account of the antithesis, Peter might have said: Let him rather glory; but he teaches that the glory must be ascribed to God." Bengel. Let him glorify God by patience, by good courage, confessing the faith, and by joyful praises and thanksgiving.—*ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ.*—(Lachmann and Tischendorf read *ὀνόματι* at because of the name of Christ. Others render, less aptly; matter, case). [See Appar. Crit., v. 16, note 17. M.]—Steiger:—"In this lot which falls to him." It is difficult to prove this use of *μέρος*. It is rather to be taken as ch. iii. 16. *ἐν ᾧ καταλαλῶσιν*, they were to glorify God in the very thing for which they were slandered, viz.: their faith in Christ.

VER. 17 introduces a new ground why Christians should gladly suffer for Christ's sake. Possessed of such a mind (the mind of suffering gladly for Christ's sake), they will be delivered from the near and inevitable judgment of God which is about to burst on unbelievers, but begins at the Church of God in the persecutions that are coming on her. The former will feel the whole weight of the judgment, the latter its first beginnings only, whereby they are saved.

It is time.—As it is the inflexible purpose of God that we must through much tribulation enter the kingdom of God, and as it is a well-known law of the Divine kingdom that judgment must begin at the city and house of God, Jer. xxv. 29; x. 18; xiv. 18, 19; xlix. 12; Amos iii. 14; Ezek. ix. 6; xxi..4; Heb. xii. 6, as manifested in the troubles of Israel in Egypt and in the wilderness, so now is the season of the judgment, for the end of all things is at hand, v. 7.

The judgment.—To believers it is a paternal chastisement, contemplating their deliverance from unknown and unrepented sins, in or-

der that they may not be condemned with the world, 1 Cor. xi. 28. 31; it is to them a judgment of mercy, but to unbelievers a judgment of wrath, revealing the punitive justice of God. The one leads to salvation, the other to perdition, cf. Lke. xxiii. 30; Matt. xxv. 41; Rev. vi. 15–17; xx. 11–15; Rom. ii. 5; 2 Thess. i. 6.

At the house of God.—Cf. ch. ii. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 15. The Church of the Lord. Steiger has several quotations from the Rabbis stating that the judgment will begin with the righteous.

What will be the end of them?—What will be their final state? "If the sons are chastised, what have the most malicious slaves to expect? How will it fare with the unrighteous before Thee, if Thou dost not even spare Thy believing children, in order to exercise and instruct them?" Augustine.—Cf. Lke. xxiii. 31; Jer. xlix. 12; Ps. i. 6.—τῶν ἀπειθούντων.—Cf. ch. ii. 8; iii. 20; Jno. xvi. 8. 9. [Bengel:—"*Judicium, initio tolerabilius, sensim ingravescit. Pii sua parte perfuncti cum immunitate spectant miserias impiorum: impii dum pios affligunt, suam mensuram implent et discunt quæ sua ipsorum portio futura sit: sed id melius sciunt pii, quare patientes sunt.*"—M.].

Ver. 18. **If the righteous hardly is saved.**—The thought of v. 17 is verified and strengthened by the verbatim quotation of Prov. xi. 31 in the LXX. The Apostle may also have remembered the accounts which Christ Himself gave of the great perils of the last temptations, Matt. xxiv. 12. 13. 22. 24.—μόλις, with difficulty, with hard pains and not without suffering.—ποῦ φανεῖται, Ps. i. 4. 5, describes the ungodly as chaff which the wind scattereth away.—Δίκαιος=πιστεύων, one who as a believer leads a life well-pleasing and acceptable to God, is justified and follows after righteousness. The opposite, ἀπειθῶν and ἀσεβής.—σώζεται sc., unto life eternal. The opposite, to be lost, to fall hopelessly into perdition.

Ver. 19. **Wherefore—well-doings.**—General conclusion from the entire exhortation. If suffering according to the purpose of God is so necessary, if it contemplates such glorious ends, we ought patiently to submit to this Divine necessity (German:—*göttlichem Muss*), ch. i. 6; v. 9, commit our soul to Him, on whom we have a firm and sacred hold, and never lose sight of the equal necessity that we continue in well-doing.—καὶ οἱ πάσχοντες—Some take it as in ch. iii. 14; others join it with ὥστε, although it is never used to strengthen ὥστε. Better follow Wiesinger: "The end and aim of every thing should be the glory of God, v. 11, hence also suffering." Those also who do not suffer are to commit their souls to the faithful Creator.

According to the will of God.—Ch. iii. 17; iv. 17. This contains a consolation and a reason for the following exhortation.—ὡς πιστῷ κτίστῃ.—He has not only created our souls originally, but also created them anew in Christ. Inasmuch as He is faithful, it is His blessed will to finish the good work He has begun, and to make good all His promises. As our Creator, He has the first claim upon us, Acts iv. 24. [Oecumenius:—ἀσφαλὴς καὶ ἀψευδὴς κατὰ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ.—M.]—παρατιθέσθωσαν.—As Christ's dying words were: "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," Lke. xxiii. 46; cf. 1 Pet. i. 9.—He is the most trusty Guardian of our souls, Ps. xxxi 6; Eccl. xii. 7, and our bodies also are in the hands of God. Without His will, not a hair of His children can be hurt. "As the most faithful, He *will* preserve them, as the most mighty He *can* do it." Gerhard.—ἐν ἀγαθοποιΐαις.—In well-doings. The apposition goes back to v. 15 and v. 16. Trust in God and well-doing must be indissolubly united. "Only inasmuch as faith restores the primal spiritual relation of Creator and creature, man is warranted to rejoice over this faithfulness of the Creator." Steiger. Cf. Matt. x. 28: 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 9; Ps. cxxxviii. 8; ciii. 14.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. There is no reward attached to suffering as such; it is only the patience and constancy with which, for Christ's sake, suffering is borne, to which reward is mercifully promised.

2. The Holy Ghost who rests upon saints, protects them, shines forth from them, is called the Spirit of Glory because, says Roos, He is holy, and causes His holiness to radiate, and because He is worthy of being glorified by men and all other creatures.

3. "The fire of trial belongs to Christianity, it is the rule, not the exception." Richter.

4. Why does judgment begin at the house of God? 1. There is one law for the Church as a whole, and for the individual members of it. Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, Heb. xii. 6. A father, if he is earnestly opposed to evil, chastises first his children, afterward his household. He is first severe to the former, afterward also to the latter. Since cleansing from sin is the end contemplated, enlightened believers recognize a merciful provision in being judged now that they may be saved hereafter. Hence it is one of the prerogatives of the house of God that it is destined to pass through the judgment of grace in time, in order that it may be saved from the future judgment of wrath. 2. Because thereby the accuser of our souls and censurer of God's ways, and his followers, are silenced and deprived of all objections against the justice of God.

5. Verse 17 is not in conflict with Jno. iii. 18. "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already;" all that is necessary is to distinguish the judgment of grace from the judgment of wrath, and temporal punishment from eternal.

6. The words, "It is time that judgment should begin"—supply a hint concerning the date of this Epistle. The destruction of Jerusalem could not have taken place when the author wrote this passage.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The cross, the fire-proof of faith.—Why ought we not to be astonished at the heat of tribulation? *a.* It comes from God. *b.* It is designed to put us to the test. *c.* It is meet that the flesh should suffer and that sinners should have trouble. *d.* The way of Christ goes through sufferings to glory. *e.* Suffering with Christ is a token of the

state of grace and an earnest of future glory. *f.* Sufferings are no disgrace but an honour. *g.* They are attended by a sense of blessedness in the foretaste of expected glory. *h.* The patience which we exhibit saves us from the judgment of wrath, which overtakes the ungodly. *i.* Not even the smallest injury can befall believers without the will of God, and all things must conduce to their salvation.—What is suffering with Christ? *a.* Not to do any wrong that renders us liable to just punishment. *b.* To suffer innocently for righteousness' sake. *c.* To suffer for Christ's sake, and in communion with Him.

Zeller: "Like as our secular princes distinguish faithful and constant servants and victorious generals with the badge of some order, so the Lord of lords distinguishes His faithful servants and victors with crosses of suffering in order to prepare them a joy, as with a cross of honour and a token and assured expectation of the great honour that, as those, who with Christ continue patient in suffering, they shall be blessed hereafter with joy and gladness when at His second and even at His third coming, He shall reveal the glory of His power, and raise them to participation in the glory of His kingdom."

Besser: As our Lord at His first coming began with the purifying of the Temple, so it is the token of the commencement of His second coming that He refines His house as with a refiner's fire. Mal. iii. 2.

Starke: Little pain, great refreshing. Both with Christ, how glorious! What is taken from thee, for which thou dost not receive a millionfold reward? What boots then, thy complaining and weeping? Let us look upon the future and sweeten therewith the present. Marks [German '*Moles*' Maalzeichen.—M.] of Christ are tokens of honour. Disgrace before the world is exaltation before God and His angels.—Peter had made experience both of being astonished at the heat of tribulation, Matt. xvi. 22, and of rejoicing in suffering with Christ, Acts v. 41.—Partners in the fight, partners in the coronation. As surely as thou art suffering for Christ's sake, so surely thou wilt be eternally clothed with joy and glory.—Art thou faint-hearted and timid in the state of temptation, observe where thou art suffering for Christ's sake, and rejoice, for this is to thee an infallible token that thou art the Lord's, Jno. xv. 19. Thou sayest: I have to suffer much; examine thyself, if it is not thine own fault; if it is, do not complain, but repent and amend. Lam. iii. 39.—If a Christian, who is neither in the magistracy nor the ministry, is unable to do anything towards the improvement of much that is disorderly, it is enough for him to sigh, to desire and to commit it to God, Ezek. ix. 4.—They call thee, and thou art a Christian; then remember thy Head from whom thou hast thy name, thy anointing which thou hast received from Him, 1 Jno. ii. 27, and thy duty, to follow Him, Matt. x. 38.—The wrath of God is no jest. Fear, whosoever thou art, for sin which cannot stand before the judgment seat, cleaves to thee, Job xxxiv. 11.—Many sorrows shall be to the wicked, Ps. xxxii. 10, while the godly simply hold and taste the cup of God, the ungodly have to drink the very dregs, Ps. lxxv. 9.—Unbelief is the greatest sin and the real cause of the temporal and eternal judgments of God, Mk. xvi. 16.—Let none envy the prosperity of the wicked: alas! it will fare ill with them in eternity, unless they repent, Ps. lxxiii. 12.—A true Christian ought neither to cause his own sufferings, nor wish for them, but commit everything to the will of God, 1 Sam. iii. 18.—Whoso committeth his soul to God must be in a state of grace and holiness, otherwise all his committing is lost and in vain. Job xvi. 17.—The soul, if we die a happy death, will surely go to God, who will preserve it as an immortal spirit, and the more so because it has been saved by Christ and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Jno. v. 24.

Roos: God decrees punishment on the righteous on account of their probable indolence, on account of their abuse of His grace and means of grace, or also on account of other disorders and failures, which, unless they are checked, might lead us to positive falling away from grace.—The word of God announces loving severity and wholesome strictness; God is very exact with His family.

Lisco: Blessed are innocent sufferers.—The hidden glory of the sharers of Christ reign. The different import of sufferings, *a*, in the house of God; *b*, in sinners.

Stier: How Christians ought to submit to suffering.

Kapff: The school of the cross, the school of heaven; 1, There is no way to heaven without the cross; 2, Heaven is opened in the cross; 3, The crown of the cross is in heaven.

[Leighton:—Ver. 12. In these fires, as faith is tried, the word on which faith relies is tried, and is found *all gold*, most precious, no refuse in it. The truth and sweetness of the promises are much confirmed in the Christian's heart upon his experiment of them in his sufferings; his God is found to be as good as His word, being with him when he goes through the fire, Is. xliii. 2, preserving him that he loses nothing except dross, which is a gainful loss, leaving only his corruption behind him.

Ver. 13. I remember what that pious duke is said to have declared at Jerusalem, when they offered to crown him king there, "*Nolo auream, ubi Christus spineam.*"

Ver. 14. Here what the Apostle had said, concerning suffering in general, he specifies in the particular case of suffering reproaches; but this expression seems not to come up to the height of that which he has used before; he spoke of *fiery trial*, but this of reproach seems rather fit to be called an *airy trial*, the blast of vanquishing words. Yet upon trial it will be found to be (as it is here accounted) a very sharp, a *fiery trial*, cf. Jas. iii. 6.—M.]

[Macknight:—Ver. 12. The metaphor is old but noble: it represents the Christians at Pontus as having *fire* cast upon them, for trying of their faith, as *gold* is tried by fire, ch. i. 7, to which the Apostle alludes.—M.]

[Ver. 17. In *Bava Kama*, fol. 60. 1. the following passage occurs: "God never punishes the world but because of the wicked, but He always begins with the righteous first. The destroyer makes no difference between the just and the unjust: only he begins first with the righteous."—M.]

CHAPTER V. 1-4.

ANALYSIS: Elders are exhorted in sufferings also to tend the flock of Christ aright and to be patterns to them.

1 [1]The elders [2]which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder[3], and a witness of
2 the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed:[4] [5]Feed
the flock of God which is among you,[6] taking the oversight *thereof*, not by constraint,[7]
3 but willingly; not[8] for filthy lucre,[9] but of a ready mind;[10] Neither as being lords[11]
4 over *God's* heritage,[12] but being[13] ensamples[14] to the flock. And when the chief Shep-
herd shall appear,[15] ye shall receive[16] a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

Verse 1. [[1] πρεσβυτέρους without the article, simply *elders*.—M.]
[[2] Receptus omits οὖν after πρεσβυτέρους but supplies τοὺς so K. L. (and Lachmann); on the other hand the important Codd. A. B. insert οὖν, so Alford; also Sinait.—M.]
[[3] ὁ συμπρεσβυτέρος—the fellow-elder.—M.]
[[4] μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης—the glory which is about to be revealed. Translate the whole verse; "Elders therefore among you I, a fellow-elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ, also a partaker of the glory which is about to be revealed, exhort."—M.]

Verse 2. [[5] ποιμάνατε—tend, pasture better than feed which only expresses one office of a shepherd; the Greek denotes all his duties, and it is impossible to convey in English the force of ποιμάνατε τὸ ποίμνιον.—M.]
[[6] ἐπισκοποῦντες, omitted in B. and Sinait.,—overseeing it. Those who remove this word do it perhaps "for ecclesiastical reasons, for fear πρεσβύτεροι should be supposed to be as they really were, ἐπίσκοποι." (Alford). "*Ipsum episcopatus nomen et officium exprimere voluit.*" (Calvin).—M.]
[[7] ἀναγκαστῶς—constrainedly.—M.]
[[8] μηδὲ—nor yet, stronger than not; "it brings in a climax each time." (Alford).—M.]
[[9] αἰσχροκερδῶς—for the sake of sordid gain.—M.]
[[10] προθύμως—zealously, eagerly.—M.]

Verse 3. [[11] κατακυριεύοντες—lording it over; see note below.
[[12] τῶν κλήρων, κλῆρος—lot, portion. Simply the lots or portions committed to their care; that is, of the universal flock of Christ, subdivisions such as dioceses, parishes, etc. Erasmus: "*Cleros autem vocat non Diaconos aut Presbyteros, sed gregem qui cuique forte contigit gubernandus.*" Estius: "*Gregis Dominici portiones, quæ singulis episcopis pascendæ et regandæ velut sortito, obtigerunt.*" So Bengel, Wiesinger, de Wette, Alford, and others.—M.]
[[13] γινόμενοι—becoming.—M.]
[[14] τύποι—patterns.—M.]

Verse 4. [[15] φανερωθέντος—when (the Chief Shepherd) is manifested.—M.]
[[16] τὸν ἀμαράντινον στέφανον—the amaranthine crown, not—ἀμάραντος, but the adjective derived from it; the crown made of everlasting flowers. The literal translation might be retained with advantage: the expression is poetical and very beautiful and used by Pope and Cowper.

The only *amaranthine* flower on earth
Is virtue; the only lasting treasure, truth.—*Cowper.*——M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The final exhortation bears on the outward differences of position in the Church.

VER. 1. Elders among you.—זְקֵנִים. The word occurs for the first time in Ex. iii. 16. 18. They were in Israel the heads of the twelve tribes, the chiefs or princes of the tribe, cf. Numb. ii. In the place of this primitive arrangement, at the instance of Jethro, representative elders were chosen, Ex. xviii. 13, "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness;" and from their number a select committee (as we should say) of seventy elders was taken, Ex. xxiv. 9; Numb. xi. 16. Elders are also mentioned in connection with particular communities, Ruth iv. 2; 1 Sam. xi. 3; Josh. xx. 4. Christianity received these institutions as they existed; they were retained in Jewish-Christian Churches, and introduced into Gentile-Christian Churches. We find them at Antioch, Acts xi. 30, in the Church at Jerusalem, ch. xv. 2. 4; xxi. 18; Jas. v. 14, and thus in our passage. They were not always (yet doubtless often) those oldest in years, but rather the most experienced and matured among the converted members of the Church. They are also called bishops=overseers, Acts xx. 17. 28; Tit. i. 5. 7; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1. 8. They were chosen by the Apostles, with the concurrence of the Churches, Acts xiv. 23; Tit. i. 5; their functions were to oversee, to administer order and direct discipline, to watch over pure doctrine and even to teach, although the last was not their exclusive function, 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11; Rom. xii. 7. After the Apostolic age, the office of bishop and elder were gradually separated. During the life-time of the Apostles, the supreme direction of the Churches was wielded by them, but they put themselves on a level with the elders, hence Peter calls himself συμπρεσβύτερος, and John describes himself as πρεσβύτερος, 2 Jno. 1; 3 Jno. 1. "Sp," says Grotius, "the Roman generals were wont to call their soldiers, comrades, *commilitones*." But the sense is different. The antithesis in v. 5 shows that πρεσβυτέρους refers also to age.—τοὺς ἐν ὑμιν.—τούς, as Steiger supposes, has no particular significance as rendering ἐν ὑμῖν more emphatic.

I——exhort.—Gerhard says that Peter advances three grounds taken from his own person, on which he bases his exhortation. First, he calls himself a fellow-elder, as a brother in office rightly exhorts his brethren; he calls himself a witness of the sufferings of Christ, not only because he has preached the death and cross of Christ, but also because he had borne witness to Christ in very deed, in having endured various sufferings for Christ's sake. But it is necessary to add the remark of Grotius, that "Peter had

seen Him bound, and probably had been a distant spectator of the crucifixion." The second ground is his Apostolical vocation, sealed by sufferings, cf. 1 Cor. i. 23; Col. i. 24. 25; Gal. vi. 17. The καί evidently indicates that μάρτυς denotes also his actual testimony, cf. Heb. xii. 1; Acts xxii. 20; Rev. ii. 13. He is also partaker of the future glory, because he was himself partaker of the sufferings of Christ. The readers of this Epistle were to look forward to the future glory with the same assurance in which he was expecting it. This is the third ground of his exhortation. [But compare Jno. xiii. 36, to which the Apostle not improbably alludes.—M.]. Gerhard:—"The heavenly glory, the reward of fidelity, will be common to you and me, if you also will manifest due zeal in the discharge of your duty." μελλούσης δόξης, cf. ch. i. 5. 7; iv. 13. 14.

VER. 2. **Tend the flock.**—ποιμαίνω, as distinguished from ἐπισκοπέω, denotes: Lead it to the wholesome pasture of the Divine word, guard it from the poisonous weeds of false doctrine, and go before it by your own example in well-doing, ch. iv. 19; cf. Jno. xxi. 17; Jer. iii. 15; xxiii. 1–4; Ezek. xxxiv. 2; Jno. x. 12; Acts xx. 28; Ps. xxiii. 1. Bernard:—"Tend (pasture) it with thy mind, with thy mouth, with thy work, tend it with prayer, with exhortation, and the exhibition of thy example." Let the Chief Shepherd be your pattern, Jno. x. 11.

The flock of God which is among you.—Know that it belongs not to you, but to God, to whom you will have to render account.—τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν, not, as Erasmus: "as far as in you lieth" [*quantum in vobis est*], but: the flock which is among you, with you, in your immediate region [in your parish, as we would say,—M.], the section of the one Church which is committed to your charge, cf. ch. i. 18–21; Acts xx. 28; Jno. x. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 25; Lke. xii. 32. Do not imagine that the flock is yours, you are only servants. Of like import are the words of Jesus to Peter, Jno. xxi. 15. 16. [Gerhard says: "*qui vobiscum est, videlicet cum quo unum corpus, una ecclesia estis.*"—M.].

Overseeing it—but zealously.—ἐπισκοποῦντες (Lachmann and Tischendorf, sustained by many authorities, retain this word) defines ποιμάνατε, and denotes, looking after, overseeing, watching with great care something for some one, Heb. xii. 15; Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iv. 16; Tit. i. 9; Hebr. xiii. 17. Take heed that no wolves come to devour the sheep, avert, in general, all dangers from them, and watch with great care over every thing that belongs to their welfare.—How must the flock be tended (pastured)? Peter cautions them against three sins of the pastoral office, and exhorts them to the practice of the opposite virtues.—μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς refers not to the flock, but to the shepherds, and respects at once the acceptance and the conduct of their office. In those days, persuasion, bordering on constraint, was probably necessary in order to induce one to accept or continue in the office of a presbyter. Gregory the Great confesses that he would never compel any one to accept the Episcopate. Steiger expounds: not only because it belongs to our office, but of free will, as God demands it. (Lachmann adds κατὰ Θεόν). "Those pastors are not without censure who, could they do as they would like to do, would rather be any thing than pastors." Bengel. [*Coacte pascit gregem Dei, qui propter rerum temporalium penuriam non habet unde vivat, idcirco prædicat Evangelium ut de Evangelio vivere possit.* Bede. "*Dum agimus ac necessitatis præscriptum, lente et frigide in opere progredimur.*" Calvin.—M.].

Willingly.—Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 17; Ps. liv. 8; Ex. xxxvi. 2. This willing spirit flows from the love we cherish for the Chief Shepherd and the flock, Jno. x. 12; xxi. 15–17.

Nor yet for the sake of sordid gain.—Some turned religion into a trade, 1 Tim. vi. 5; the Apostle cautions against that sin. Cf. Tit. i. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 8; 2 Pet. ii. 13; Is. lvi. 11; Jer. vi. 13; viii. 10; Micah iii. 11. 5; Ezek. xiii. 19. "Where the love of gain reigns, the shepherds are apt to become hirelings, yea, even wolves."—"Those who pamper their body—seek the milk and wool of the sheep." Luther.—προθύμως denotes inward delight and zeal in the salvation and guidance of souls, in opposition to selfish motives. [Bede illustrates the word by the children of Israel, among whom even the workmen gave their services eagerly and gratuitously in the building of the tabernacle.—M.].

VER. 3. **Nor yet as lording it over** (the cure committed to them).—[So the German.—M.].—κατακυριεύειν, Matt. xx. 25; Mk. x. 42; Acts xx. 29; cf. Jas. ii. 6; Rom. xv. 16. It denotes more than κυριεύειν, Lke. xxii. 25; 2 Cor. i. 24, for κατά carries the idea of hostility and pride.—τῶν κλήρων; κλῆρος=lot, portion of inheritance, heritage, Acts xxvi. 18; Col. i. 12; cf. Deut. iv. 20; ix. 29. So the people of Israel are called the heritage of God. In the New Testament the word was applied to those portions of the Christian Church which were assigned to individual elders as their lot. So Gerhard, Calov and others. It is altogether erroneous to expound κλῆρος as denoting the clergy in its orders, for it answers to ποιμνίον, cf. Acts xvii. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 35; 2 Cor. ii. 10.

[1. κλῆρος, in the sense of portion, is the meaning attached to this word, besides the Commentators already cited, by Erasmus ("*gregem qui cuique forte contigit gubernandus*"), Estius ("*gregis Dominici portiones, quæ singulis episcopis pascendæ et regendæ velut sortito, obtigerunt*"), Bengel, Wolf, Steiger, de Wette, Huther, Wiesinger, Alford; 2. κλῆρος, in the sense of *heritage of God*, is the meaning given by Cyril (on Is. iii. 2), Calvin ("*quum universum ecclesiæ corpus hæreditas sit domini, todidem sunt veluti prædia, quorum culturam singulis presbyteris assignat.*"), Beza, E. V., Grotius, Benson, al. The objections to this view are, according to Alford, that κλῆροι could not be taken for portions of κλῆρος, and that Θεοῦ could in this case hardly be wanting; 3. κλῆρος, in the sense of *the clergy*, is the anachronistical meaning attached to the word chiefly by Roman Catholic Commentators; so even Oecumenius, Jerome, à Lapide ("*jubet ergo S. Petrus Episcopis et Pastoribus, ne inferioribus clericis imperiose dominari velint*"), Fenardentius, al.; 4. Bodwell arbitrarily explains the word of *Church-goods*, and is refuted by Wolf, *Curæ h. l.*—The correctness of the meaning of the text, namely, the first as given

above, is evident from τοῦ ποιμνίου, the flock, which corresponds to τῶν κλήρων.—M.]

But (becoming) patterns.—ἀλλὰ τύποι.—Cornelius correctly remarks that Peter opposes this pattern to their lording. They must rule by example, not by ordering. Athanasius:—"The life should command, and the tongue persuade."

[Wordsworth:—"St. Peter happily uses the plural, κλῆροι; for in Christian times, it is not *one* nation, as it had been of old, which is the chosen people and heritage of God, but *all national Churches, all congregations* of Pastors and People are *heritages* of the Lord; each "Church and each congregation", which every Pastor serves, is, in a mystical sense, as the English Ordinal declares, "The Spouse and Body of Christ." By the word κλῆροι, therefore, we may understand here the faithful people of Christ, distributed in regular order into various dioceses, parishes, churches, and congregations, like the companies to which our Lord distributed the loaves and fishes by the hands of His Apostles."

"Here is another caution from St. Peter's mouth, which may be commended to the consideration of those who call themselves his successors. 'The Apostle forbiddeth *dominari in cleris*.' But they who claim to be his successors are not afraid to 'teach that their own judgments are infallible, and to make their definitions an universal Rule of Faith, and to require subjection to their laws and persons, as of necessity to salvation, and to be called '*Dominus Deus noster Papa*,' (Gloss, in *Extrav. Papæ*; Johann. 22, Tit. xiv. 4), etc., all which and much more is professed by the Popes and in their behalf. No modest man can deny that this amounts to as much as St. Peter's *dominari in cleris*, even to the exercising of such lordship over the Lord's heritage, the Christian Church, as will become none but the Lord Himself, whose heritage it is." Bp. Sanderson, 3, p. 283. Apposite are also the following quotations from Bernard: ("*Monstrosa res est gradus summus et animus infimus, sedes prima et vita ima, lingua magniloqua et vita otiosa, sermo multus et functus nullus*"), Gregory, ("*Informis est vita pastoris, qui modo calicem Dei signat, modo talos agitat: qui in avibus cœli ludit, canes instigat etc.*"), and Gerhard ("*Pastor ante oves vadit*").—M.]

VER. 4. **And when—amaranthine crown of glory.**—"Instead of sordid gain, and the empty honour of ruling, the Apostle shows to them noble gain and a true crown of honour." Besser. Cf. Dan. xii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 45; xxv. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 8.—ἀρχιποίμενος, ch. ii. 25; Heb. xiii. 20; cf. Ezek. xxxiv. 15. 23; Ps. xxiii.; Jno. x. 11.—καί=then also.—φανερωθέντος, like ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι, relates to the visible return of Christ, ch. i. 5. 7; cf. Col. iii. 4; 1 Jno. ii. 28; iii. 2.—κομίζεσθαι, see i. 9.—ἀμαράντινος=ἀμάραντος, ch. i. 4.—τὸν τῆς δόξης στέφανον.—The crowns (wreaths) with which warriors and the successful competitors in the games used to be adorned were made of flowers, herbs, ivy, laurel leaves, and olive branches. Holy Scripture speaks of a crown of righteousness, 2 Tim. iv. 8, a crown of life, Jas. i. 12; Rev. ii. 10, and here of a crown of glory. Instead of a crown of thorns, the Christian victor shall hereafter be adorned with a living, heavenly crown. Whether there is a difference between these crowns, or whether they are all one and the same crown, will only be disclosed in eternity. Besser explains it as a token of the royal dignity of believers, of which Zech. vi. 13 may be regarded the type, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 25. Hugo, Thomas Aquinas, Salmero understand by it a higher stage of eternal life.—δόξης must not be diluted into "the wreath which is glory"—or a very glorious crown, but the crown which reflects the glory of God, cf. ch. i. 7; v. 10. [The glory of Christ is probably this amaranthine crown, cf. 1 Pet. v. 1; iv. 13; i. 7, and v. 10 below; also 1 Jno. iii. 2, etc.—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The title of Chief Shepherd which is here ascribed to Christ in relation to the under-shepherds, His servants, involves the Divine origin of the pastoral office. It describes Christ not only as superior in dignity to the other shepherds, but as their superior in power, in whose name and in whose stead they hold the pastoral office, to whom belong both the sheep and the shepherds, because He has given His life for them, Jno. x. 11; Acts xx. 28, to whom the shepherds are consequently responsible, and from whom they have to expect the reward or the punishment of the conduct of their office, 1 Cor. iv. 5; so Calvin, Calov and others.

2. To give, as Schwegler does, v. 4, a polemical reference to then existing hierarchical tendencies, and thence to argue against the genuineness of the Epistle, is a decided perversion of the right stand point.

3. The institution of the presbyterate is not stated explicitly, but it was already in existence before the death of the elder James, and before Paul's first missionary journey to Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30. It appears, says Weiss, to have everywhere originated with the founding and more independent establishment and organization of the Christian Church, especially in Jewish-Christian congregations, which followed the precedent of their mother Church. Paul on his first missionary journey ordained elders everywhere, Acts xiv. 23.

4. This Epistle does not yet refer to different offices in the Church. We have before us the most simple form of Church-constitution, under which all other offices were as yet included in the Apostolate and the Presbyterate. As in ch. ii. 25, the Lord is called the Shepherd and Bishop (overseer) of the Church, so the elders were to continue under Him these His functions, that is, on the one hand to teach and exhort, and to arrange Divine worship, and on the other to take care that all things should be done honestly and orderly, to administer the discipline and to provide for the support of the poor.

5. Peter considers self-sacrificing love and self-abasing humility the most essential qualifications of true spiritual pastors.

6. The declarations of Holy Scripture concerning the glory of the life to come, and its crowns of honour, ought to be dealt with as having more reality than common theology is wont to do. "The full import of these crowns we shall never understand in our bodily life. But from their very names, we may conclude that

they constitute a great glory, and indicate a title to live with Christ after death and royally to reign with Him after suffering, 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rev. xxii. 5." Roos.

7. [The Commentators justly observe that if Peter had been the prince or chief of the Apostles, as the Papists affirm, he would in this place and in the inscription of his two Epistles, have assumed to himself that high prerogative.—Macknight.—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The pastoral office a gift of God to the Churches. 1. The extent of its duties; 2. the mind in which it must be administered.—Preachers should give testimony drawn from their own experience.—How to avoid the three capital faults of unfaithful pastors. Look through shame and death to the crown of honour and the crown of life prepared for those who overcome.

STARKE:—A lofty saying: Who would gladly neglect the flock and sheep of Christ? 1 Cor. iv. 2.—We may be fully assured of our salvation: witnesses and testimonies of it abound, Rom. viii. 16.—Rich cross-bearers! which are the riches, and where are they? They are more than those of earth, and well secured in heaven. Believe, hope and desire, and you will know it, 1 Jno. iii. 2.—A minister must lead his flock as a shepherd to wholesome pasture, rule it with the rod of his mouth, Is. xi. 4, with the staves beauty and bands, Zech. xi. 7 (German, "gentleness and pain"), and in all respects be watchful, that they suffer no injury whatsoever, Is. lxii. 6.—Hearers should possess the characteristics of good sheep to acquire the mind of Christ their Chief Shepherd and to hear His voice and that of faithful under-shepherds with ready obedience.—No rule whatsoever belongs to the office of a preacher; preachers are servants, not rulers, Matt. xx. 25. 26.—Teacher, thou oughtest not only to teach rightly, but also to live rightly, lest thou do not build up with one hand and tear down with the other, 1 Thess. ii. 10. If all believers are indiscriminately a royal priesthood, this distinction is especially true of faithful teachers whose dignity is indicated by the crown, and although they possess this dignity already in the new man, it will increasingly appear at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

ROOS:—"Let us belong only to those who, leading an honest life, may indulge the hope of receiving such crowns, although as yet we do not understand their nature."

LISCO:—The Christian pastoral office: 1. Its duties; 2. Its motives; 3. Its reward.

RICHTER:—"Christian teachers and preachers must not rule by authority, but guide and direct by the power of truth and love and the force of example. Let no pastor be a pope." The pastors of a Church should seek their preëminence in that they first keep the commandments of Christ, and thus incite others to emulation, Phil. iii. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 7.

[LEIGHTON:—VER. 1. The blessing of a faithful pastor. "*Satius solem non lucere quam Chrysostomum non docere.*" VER. 2. Had I, says Bernard, some of that blood poured forth on the cross, how carefully would I carry it, and ought I not to be as careful of those souls that it was shed for?—All believers are God's clergy (κλῆρος).—M.]

CHAPTER V. 5–11.

ANALYSIS:—Exhortation, addressed especially to the younger, to subjection, and to all, to continued humility, to submissiveness to the hand of God, to faithfulness and vigilance, and thus to resist the devil. God Himself will then perfect and strengthen them.

5 Likewise, ye younger, [1]submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all *of you* be sub-
ject[2] one to another, and be clothed[3] with humility: [4] for God resisteth[5] the proud and
6 [6]giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand
7 of God, that he may exalt you in due time[7]: Casting[8] all your care upon him; for he
8 careth for you. Be sober, be vigilant; because[9] your adversary the devil, as a roar-
9 ing lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour.[10] Whom resist steadfast[11] in
the faith, knowing that the same afflictions[12] are accomplished[13] in your brethren[14]
10 that are in the world.[15] But the God of all grace, who hath called us[16] unto his eter-
nal glory by[17] Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while,[18] make you perfect,
11 stablish,[19] strengthen, settle[20] *you*. To him *be* glory[21] and dominion for ever and
ever.[22] Amen.

Verse 5. [[1] ὑποτάγητε—be subject.—M.]
[[2] Rec. after ἀλλήλοις inserts ὑποτασσόμενοι, with K. L.; A. B., Sinait. and many versions omit it.—M.] So also Lachmann and Tischendorf; in that case, translate, "yea, all gird on humility to one another."
[[3] ἐγκομβώσασθε, to bind a thing on oneself, wear it constantly; the sense is, wear humility as a garment, and retaining the translation of E. V., render: "clothe yourselves with humility." For the etymology of the word, see note below.—M.]

[4 ὅτι—because.—M.]
[5 ἀντιτάσσεται—setteth himself in opposition to, *i. e.*, opposeth himself to.—M.]
[6 δὲ—*but*, not '*and*.'—M.]

Verse 6. [7 ἐν καιρῷ—in His time (Germ.), in the time appointed. καιρός, an anarthrous concrete, Winer, p. 130. —M.]

Verse 7. [8 πᾶσαν τήν μέριμναν—all your care, that is, in its entireness, once for all, so as to render the recurrence of it impossible.—M.]

Verse 8. [9 Rec., with L., inserts ὅτι before ἀντίδικος.—M.]
[10 K. L. and others have τίνα καταπιεῖν; Sin. καταπῖν.—M.]

Verse 9. [11 στερεοί—firm, better than stedfast.—M.]
[12 τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων—the self-same sufferings; this construction occurs no where else in the New Testament.—M.]
[13 ἐπιτελεῖσθαι—are being accomplished, in course of accomplishment.—M.]
[14 ἀδελφότητι—brotherhood.—M.]
[15 Translate the whole verse: "Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour; whom (to whom offer resistance) resist, firm in the faith, knowing that the self-same sufferings are being accomplished by your brotherhood in the world."—M.]

Verse 10. [16 Rec., with K. and several versions, reads ἡμᾶς, but A. B. L. and others have ὑμᾶς; so also Sinait.—M.]
[17 ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ—*in* (not *by*) Christ Jesus.—M.]
[18 ὀλίγον παθόντας—when ye have suffered a little while.—M.]
[19 Rec., with K. L., inserts ὑμᾶς after καταρτίσει; A. B. and others omit it. στηρίξει—to confirm, establish.—M.]
[20 θεμελιώσει—ground you, fix you on a foundation.—M.]

Verse 11. [21 Translate: "To Him *is* glory," preferable to the Subjunctive. Rec., with K. L., etc., reads ἡ δόξα καὶ before τὸ κράτος.—M.]
[22 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων—unto the ages of the ages. B. omits the last words.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 5. **Likewise ye younger - - the elder.**—ὁμοίως, as in ch. iii. 7, leads to the corresponding duty of the younger members of the Church in general. These are not laymen, but the younger members of the Church in general. The antithesis would seem to warrant taking πρεσβύτεροι as describing the aged members of the Church, but this would involve understanding πρεσβύτεροι in a sense different from v. 1; moreover ὁμοίως would conflict with such an interpretation. They are accordingly elders in office, who were, as we have already shown, generally also elders in years. At the same time, it may be assumed that all the elder persons were to take a voluntary part in some, though not in all the functions of presbyters. πρεσβύτεροι and νεώτεροι denote, therefore, the contrast between those who were either bound to lead, or might voluntarily do it, and those who were led and obeying. The view of Weiss, who understands by νεώτεροι or νεανίσκοι, Acts v. 6. 10, of young persons who were to assist the elders in outward ministrations, is hardly tenable, at least on the ground on which he puts it. πάντες δὲ in what follows, embraces πρεσβύτεροι and νεώτεροι, and is not antithetical to the latter. Could a small portion of the Church only be exhorted to be subject to the presbyters? This would, at all events, necessitate the idea of official subordination in a narrowed sense. Such an observance in other Churches is also doubtful. [Alford, who takes a similar view, expresses it with more clearness and logical force. He says: "As the name πρεσβύτεροι had an official sense, viz.: superintendents, of the Church, so νεώτεροι likewise describes those who were the ruled, the disciples of the πρεσβύτεροι. Thus taken, it will mean here, the rest of the Church as opposed to πρεσβύτεροι.—M.]—ὑποτάγητε, cf. ch. ii. 13. 18; iii. 1. Calvin:—"Nothing is more repugnant to the mind of man (in his fallen state) than to be subject."

Yea all.—πάντες δὲ, inferiors are to subject themselves to superiors, wives to their husbands, children to their parents, slaves to their masters, yea, in a certain sense, all to all, cf. Phil. ii. 3; Eph. v. 21; Rom. xii. 10. This subordination, which is insisted upon as a principal point in the order of the Christian commonwealth, must be founded on humble submission to God, cf. Matt. xx. 27; xxiii. 12; Lke. xiv. 11; xviii. 14.

And clothe yourselves with humility.—τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην, lowliness of mind, which to the heathen was vile, brokenness of a proud heart, the opposite of ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν, Rom. xii. 16; cf. Phil. ii. 8; Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12.—ἐγκομβοῦσθαι from κόμβος, a string or band to tie something with, to fasten it, a knot, or from ἐγκόμβωμα, explained by Pollux, according to Riemer, of a white apron or frock worn over the clothes to keep them clean, like the dusters used by coachmen and travellers. It was a garment usually worn by slaves. Calvin and others consider it to denote a show-dress, but this cannot be proved. Calov combines the two ideas: "We are to put on humility as a garment (cf. Col. iii. 12) and have it fastened tight to us." [His language, literally translated, is somewhat ludicrous: "We should be buttoned up tight in it." —M.]—We should be thoroughly surrounded by it, have it fit close all round, and suffer nobody to tear it away from us (cf. Jno. xiii. 5, etc.,), even if it should be regarded as a servile garment. [Alford renders ἐγκομβώσασθε, gird on, from ἐγκόμβωμα, used for a kind of girdle by Longus, *Pastoralia*, 2, 33, and Pollux, 4, 119. See in Wetstein.—M.]

Because God opposeth Himself to the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.—The Apostle gives the reason for his exhortation in a citation from Prov. iii. 34, in the LXX., the only variation being the substitution of ὁ Θεός for κύριος, cf. Jas. v. 6; Prov. xxix. 23; Job xxii. 29.—ὑπερηφάνοις, Heb. לֵצִים, scorners, haughty, insolent men, unmindful of God, and proudly looking down upon others, Lke. i. 51; Rom. i. 30; 2 Tim. iii. 2. "They assault, as it were, the honour of God in seizing that which belongs to God. Other sins fly from God, pride only opposes itself to God; other sins crush men, pride only raises them against God. Hence God also, in His turn, opposes Himself to the proud." Gerhard. [Alford quotes the saying of Artabanus to Xerxes, Herod., vii. 10, ὁρᾷς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα ζῶα ὡς κεραυνοῖ ὁ Θεός, οὐδὲ ἐᾷ φαντάζεσθαι, τὰ

δὲ σμικρὰ οὐδὲν μιν κνίζει; . . . φιλέει γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολούειν.—M.].—ἀντιτάσσεται, He opposes Himself to them as with an army. This sentiment was known to some extent to the better among the heathen, because the history of the world proves it. See Steiger, cf. Dan. iv. 34.—ταπεινοῖς = עָנִי, the lowly, those who acknowledge their vileness, and consider themselves mean and low.—δίδωσι χάριν = חֵן, His good pleasure rests upon them, and He gives them proofs of it, cf. Gen. vi. 8; xviii. 3; Lke. i. 30; ii. 52; Acts ii. 47.—"The proud who persist in offering Him armed resistance, are struck down by His mighty hand." Gerhard. "There are, as it were, two hands of God under which we must humble ourselves, the one abases the proud, the other exalts the humble." Augustine. ["*Humilitas est vas gratiarum.*" ibid.—M.]

VER. 6. **Humble yourselves therefore.**—A new inference drawn from the citation from the Old Testament and the concluding exhortation. The Apostle once more reverts to suffering and causes, says Besser, the light of the citation to shine on the darkness of suffering of the Church.—ταπεινώθητε = bow yourselves in humility, recognize your impotence and the might of God; submit yourselves to Him quietly and willingly.

Under the mighty hand of God.—An allusion to ch. iv. 17, to the impending judgments. He can put down and exalt, kill and make alive, wound and heal, Acts iv. 28, 30; Deut. xxxii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 6; 2 Kings v. 7; Deut. iii. 24; Ex. xiv. 31; iii. 19; xxxii. 11; Lke. i. 51. He reveals His chastising hand also to believers in the sufferings which He sends for their refining and trial.

That He may exalt you in His time.—ἵνα ὑμᾶς, in order that in you may be fulfilled that law of the kingdom of God, "he that shall humble himself, shall be exalted," Matt. xxiii. 12.—ὑψοῦν = to raise from the dust, to comfort and help, to advance to honour from disgrace, to joy from grief, ch. i. 6. 7; cf. Jas. iv. 7. 10.—ἐν καιρῷ (Lachmann adds ἐπισκοπῆς [A and many versions.—M.], probably a later addition from ch. ii. 12) in the time appointed, the right time, here on earth or hereafter without any reference to our time.

VER. 7. **Casting all your care upon Him.**—Holy freedom from all anxious care is essential to submission to God. "The mighty hand of God is in the service of a Father's heart for He careth for you." Besser:—ἐπιῤῥίψαντες from Ps. lv. 23. ἐπιῤῥίπτω = גָּלַל and שָׁלַךְ to roll a burden, cf. Ps. xxii. 11; xxxvii. 5; Matt. vi. 25–34; Phil. iv. 6, to cast upon, to, over, Lke. xix. 25; xii. 22.—"We cast our cares upon God in believing prayer and tell Him the need which excites our care, as children are wont to confide their grief to their father. We implore His help, remembering His mercy and His mighty hand. And He is not implored in vain." Roos:—"Hence we must not struggle long with the burden of our cares but ease ourselves at once by earnest heart-yearning and fervent sighing." Calov: "μέριμνα from μέρος, μερίζω, care, as it were, divides the heart into different parts, drawing it hither and thither.—πᾶσαν τὴν, anxiety in its entireness, the whole of it, undivided and without any reserve whatsoever; great cares and small ones, cares seen or hidden, pour them out before Him.

Because He careth for you.—μέλει, because He has you at heart, He has taken it upon Himself to care for you; not a hair of your head shall perish without His will, Lke. xxi. 18; Mtt. x. 30.—[περὶ ὑμῶν. περί after verbs of caring denotes *about*. As to the distinction between περί and ὑπέρ, Weber, *Demosth.* p. 280, says: "περί *solam mentis circumspectionem vel respectum rei*, ὑπέρ *simul animi propensionem etc. significat.*" See Winer p. 390.—M.]. "Believers daily ascend Mount Moriah with Abraham, appropriating as their motto, the words, 'God will provide,' Gen. xxii. 8. The Lord will provide on that mountain, that is on the mountain of Divine Providence, whence cometh our help, Ps. cxxi." Gerhard.

VER. 8. **Be sober, be vigilant.**—That freedom from care must not degenerate into apathy, for we are still in the Church militant, not yet in the Church triumphant. To the care which troubles from within must be added the temptations which come from the kingdom of darkness. Hence the Apostle exhorts them anew to sobriety and vigilance, ch. iv. 8, i. 13. "Let this be your care." Bengel.—νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε, go inseparably together, hence no copulative. γρηγορήσατε cf. Lke. xxi. 34. 36. This watching consists, says Calov, in the prudence by which we avoid the lying in wait of Satan, in the shunning of false security and of sins and in the throwing out of sentinels, Eph. vi. 11; Matt. xxiv. 42; xxv. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 13. The exhortation based upon the words of our Lord, springs simultaneously from the Apostle's own experience, Matt. xxvi. 40. 41; Luke xxii. 45; cf. 1 Thess. v. 6. [Augustine: "*Corde vigila, fide vigila, spe vigila, caritate vigila, operibus vigila.*"—M.]

Your adversary.—The exposition which sees in "adversary" human slanderers, (Hensler and others) needs no refutation. Satan is called absolutely the adversary of believers, who stands up as the champion of law when he opposes them, their enemy, Matt. xiii. 39; John viii. 44; Rev. xii. 10; the prince of this world, Eph. ii. 2; 2 Cor. iv. 4; John xvi. 11; xii. 31; xiv. 30; Acts xxvi. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 9; 1 John iii. 8. He is the declared opponent, both of Christ and of His members. He is the accuser of the brethren, Rev. xii. 10; cf. Job i. 6, etc.

Walketh about.—As in Job i. 7, he is said to go to and fro in the earth, so here he is said to walk about, which applies not to visible appearings, but to his operations by his instruments. Scripture indeed teaches that the evil spirits are confined in hell, 2 Peter ii. 4; Jude 6; Luke viii. 31; but they are bound only in respect of their visible appearing, while they rule invisibly in the regions of the air, Eph. ii. 2; vi. 12; in darkness, they roam over desert places, Matt. xii. 43. 44; Luke xi. 24; and influence man mediately and immediately, Luke xxii. 23; John xiii. 27.

As a roaring lion.—The lion, according to Pliny, roars most violently, when he is hungry. Elsewhere Satan is compared with a serpent, on account of his cunning, 2 Cor. xi. 3; Rev. xii. 9; xx. 2; here, with a lion on account of his cruelty

and boldness, his power and strength, and his lust of injury. "When furious Jews and mad heathens began a persecution of the Christians, or attacked individual Christians, or simply threatened them, it was the devil's work, who then showed himself as a roaring lion. But since such things happened here and there, he is described as a roaring lion who walketh about. His object is to terrify and to tear, but especially to tear. His terrifying consisted of old in menacings, threatening edicts and anathemas, his tearing in executions."—Roos. [Gerhard: "*Comparatur diabolus leoni famelico et præ impatientia famis rugienti, quia perniciem nostram inexplebiliter appetit, nec ulla præda ei sufficit.*"—M.]

Seeking whom he may devour.—Cf. Matt. xxiii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 32; Heb. xi. 36. The comparison relates to both.—*καταπίνειν*, to drink greedily, to gulp or swallow down. He cannot devour every body, move them to fall away from Christ into sin, but only those who are not sober and vigilant. "The enemy and opponent of the Church despises those who are already in his power, whom he has estranged from the Church and led away captive and conquered. He passes them over, and continues to tempt those of whom he knows that Christ dwells in them."—Cyprian.

VER. 9. **Whom resist firm in the faith.**—How shall we offer resistance to this powerful enemy? 1. In firm faith. 2. In the thought that such suffering is not peculiar, but the universal lot of Christians.—*ἀντίστητε*. James iv. 7, cites the same passage; Prov. iii. 34, has the same exhortation, "Submit yourselves therefore to God;" cf. ver. 10, and the charge: "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." This circumstance renders the reference of the one Epistle to the other very probable.—"Resist him, in order to drive him back when he attacks us. The Lion of the tribe of Judah is more mighty by far than the lion of hell. His victory and His might become our own through faith." Calov. Eph. iii. 16; John xv. 4; 1 Cor. vi. 17.—"Unbelievers fear the devil as a lion, the strong in faith despise him as a worm." Isidor. "Victory over Satan lies in faith, because faith unites us to Christ, the victor. By faith the devil is driven to flight as is the lion by fire." Gerhard.—*στερεοί*, firm, immovable in faith, in faithful cleaving to Christ and His word; cf. Acts xvi. 5; Rom. iv. 20; Col. ii. 5. 7; Eph. vi. 16; iv. 14.

Knowing that the self-same sufferings—in the world.—*εἰδότες*, cf. ch. i. 18; iii. 9.—*τὰ αὐτά*, the same kind of sufferings of trial. The thought that these sufferings are common to all the brethren, is designed to warn against the conceit that they are rejected by God and man, that they are either extraordinary sinners or uncommon saints; cf. 1 Cor. x. 13.—*ἀδελφότητι*, ch. ii. 13.—*ἐν κόσμῳ*, to indicate the reason of their sufferings. You live in an imperfect world, among transitory things, and with the children of unbelief, John ix. 5.—*ἐπιτελεῖσθαι*, used of the payment and discharge of taxes and debts; of the discharge and completion of some business or combat. The ideas of payment of debt and completion may be combined; they are endured by your brethren with a view to their completion (perfecting, so *German*) by the appointment of God.—*τῇ ἀδελφότητι* for *ὑπὸ τῆς ἀδελφότητος*. De Wette and others take it as the Dative of the more remote object [*i. e.*, the Dative of reference.—M.] as in *γίνεσθαι ὑμῖν*, ch. iv. 12; so Wiesinger. "They not only are partakers of our sufferings, but our confederates in prayer and in combating the enemy."—Calov.

VER. 10. **But the God of all grace.**—A final promise full of rich consolation. *χάρις* denotes here, as in ch. iv. 10, a Divine gift of grace, *πάσης* involving a plurality of gifts, cf. ch. iii. 7; Jas. i. 17; 1 Cor. xii. 6; Heb. iv. 16; 2 Cor. v. 18; i. 3; Rom. xv. 5. "He is the source of all grace and of all goods." Gerhard. "With the idea of Him [*i. e.*, God.—M.] there is indissolubly united whatsoever is called grace." Steiger.

Who hath called you, *ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς* (Lachmann and Tischendorf read *ὑμας*, which is the more authentic reading). His call discloses to us His gracious disposition. He will complete that which He has begun, cf. ch. i. 15.

Unto his eternal glory in Christ Jesus.—The Divine act of calling us to that glory contains the earnest, that every thing will so come to pass as to take us forward to the end [*τέλος*, —M.] of the calling. *καλέσας* belongs to *ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* not to *ὀλίγον παθόντας*.—*αἰώνιον δόξαν*, ch. v. 1; iv. 13; i. 11. 5.—*ἐν χριστῷ*. In His power, for His sake and by His word, Eph. i. 3; iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9, as the calling also takes place with reference to Him, cf. Gal. i. 6; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14.

When ye have suffered a little while.—*ὀλίγον παθόντας* are rightly connected by Steiger with what has gone before in the sense: which glory will come to pass in the natural order, after we have suffered a little, or on condition that we have suffered a little, ch. iii. 14; Rom. viii. 18. So Wiesinger, cf. Phil. i. 6.—*ὀλίγον*, time as contrasted with infinite eternity, ch. i. 6. Gerhard: "The Apostle shows that from the same fountain of grace proceed both the first calling to heavenly glory and the ultimate consummation of this benefit."

Himself will perfect you.—(The Fut. Indic. of this and the following verbs is preferable to the Optat.). *καταρτίσει* from *ἄρτιος*, complete, perfect of its kind, ready. He will perfect your deficiencies, make you ready in every sense, "so that no defect remain in you." Bengel. Cf. Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Thess. iii. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

Confirm, *στηρίζειν*=to prop, make fast, to give firm stay and support to what is tottering, Luke xxii. 32: Rom. i. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Pet. i. 12; Jas. v. 8. "Nothing shall cause you to shake." Bengel.

Strengthen, *σθενώσει* from *σθένος*, might, bodily strength, hence to impart spiritual might, to strengthen spiritually. Gerhard thinks of the figure of a castle which is fortified, cf. v. 9.

Ground, *θεμελιώσει* (Lachmann omits *ὑμᾶς* and *θεμελιώσει*. Tischendorf also omits the former), *θεμελιόω*, to found, fasten in the ground (fix as on a foundation), render strong, Mtt. vii. 25; Lke. vi. 48; Heb. i. 10; figuratively, Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 58; 1 Pet. ii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 19. Take note of the intrinsic development and rise of these verbs.

To Him is the glory and the might.—*αὐτῷ ἡ δοξά*. Expression of gratitude for these exhibitions of grace; men dare not take any

share of the credit to themselves.—κράτος, the might, the rule, the authority which He employs in our preparation, Eph. iii. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 16; Heb. xiii. 21. The glory of God is the ultimate purpose of all.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Classical antiquity holds along with the recognition of the truth that God opposes Himself to the proud, the error which the prince of darkness threw into the heart of our parents, that the Deity is an envious Being, who, from jealousy, is impatient of any exaltation (Germ. *Höhe*) alongside His own. So in Herodotus, Lucanus. Many productions of modern literature, and many opinions of degraded men, exhibit just such suspicious thoughts.

2. Mute resignation, as found among fatalists, is infinitely different from that believing submission to the appointments of God, which Holy Scripture requires.

3. The teaching of Peter concerning the influence of Satan, decidedly annihilates the distortion of the truth, which here and there is advanced in our time, that the power of Satan ceased with the advent of Christ. Satan asks, says Calvin, nothing better than to be able to attack and capture us unawares. How could he better gain his end than by deceiving us into the belief of his non-existence, so as to deprive us of all fear of him.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Humility is like Jacob's ladder, which leads from earth to heaven. 1. Its ground; 2. Its manifestation.—The Christian's art of casting his care upon God. "Oh, he that can thoroughly learn this casting will experience the truth of Peter's assertions. But he that does not learn this casting remains a cast-away, a broken and subjugated man, an outcast and cast off." Luther.—Grace is a river which flows downwards.—Humility, the most precious attire.—The mighty hand of the wrath and grace of God.—The Christian's way leads from the crowd to open space, from the depth to the height.—As the devil tempts men especially to unbelief, so he can only be resisted with firm faith.—The most powerful consolation is in the cross.

Starke:—Humility, the most lowly virtue, is the highest in value, for it brings grace; rain moistens the deep valleys; lowly violets are fragrant. Pride, the portrait of Satan, and an abomination to God; a poison which mars and corrupts whatever is good. Flee, soul, from this serpent, which has bitten many saints, and, as it were, cast them out of heaven.—Art thou high, God is higher: strong, God is stronger; mighty, God is more mighty; eminent, God is majestic. Thou art under (less than) God, humble thyself under Him. Sir. iii. 20.—We must suffer before we can come to honour, and God tests our humility by suffering, to see whether it be worthy of honour, Prov. xv. 33.—Humility is not a meritorious cause of exaltation, but a way to it, Col. iii. 3. 4.—We must cast our care upon God not only in things temporal but also in things spiritual, especially in what belongs to the state of grace Then we may feel assured that in God's might, through faith, we shall be preserved unto salvation, ch. i. 5.—Man is like a pilgrim passing through a forest inhabited by bears and lions, and lodging at a place which is the home of robbers and murderers. Satan, holding unbelievers already in his power and in his claws, directs his most earnest endeavours against the godly.—Burdening oneself with eating and drinking, cares of living, and fleshly security, opens the gate and the door to the devil, that he may catch and ruin men.—Satan is strongly armed, but vincible. Faith is the best weapon, arm thyself with it for offensive and defensive warfare, Eph. vi. 16.—Nobody suffers anything new, singular or strange. Others before you also have made experience of it; the devil does not remit it to any.—Believers must always be combating, if not with men, yet with the devil and his angels. Earthly weapons are of no avail, but faith conduces to victory, Job vii. 1; Heb. xi. 30, etc.—High calling of men! not to a royal wedding, not to the receiving of a transitory heritage but to the eternal glory of God. O what riches! what honour and grace! 1 Thess. ii. 12.—Thou thinkest that thou hast to suffer a long time: vain conceit! Is not thy whole life short, how then can thy suffering be long? 2 Cor. iv. 17.—Everything with God, from God, to God! Is. xl. 29.—He who always talks of his human weakness as presenting a barrier to earnestness in the Christian life is virtually denying the God of all grace. Rev. xxi. 8.

Roos:—Confirming is opposed to being overpowered by outward sufferings and inward temptations; strengthening to weakness, timidity and want of courage exhibited in the confession of the name of Christ, and in doing His will. Grounding is an exhibition of grace, whereby Christ and the Gospel preached by the Apostles, are made so clear to the soul, that it always knows why it does or suffers anything.

Herberger:—1. What should be our deportment in adversity, and in evil days? 2. What should be our deportment in prosperity and in good days? 3. What we ought to say, if fortune smiles or frowns on us?

Stier:—The way in which we must persevere, after having come to Christ, and the great perils of this way. These are: 1. The pride of our own heart; 2. the temptation and seduction in the world around us.

Kapff:—The great blessing of humility. 1. It finds favour with God and with men; 2. it is a power against Satan; 3. it imparts strength in suffering.

Staudt:—How one resists the adversary: 1. By humility; 2. by freedom from care; 3. by sobriety; 4. with a firm faith; 5. with the remembrance of these sufferings of the brethren, of the calling to glory and of the faithful and mighty God.

[Leighton:—Ver. 5. The hoary head is indeed a crown; but when? when found in the way of righteousness, Prov. xvi. 31. There it shines and has a kind of royalty over youth: otherwise a graceless old age is a most despicable and lamentable sight. What gains an unholy old man or woman, by their scores of years, but

the more scores of guiltiness and misery? And their white hairs speak nothing but whiteness for wrath.

Humility.—That the Christian put on *that* (the thing itself), not the appearance of it, to act in as a stage-garment, but the truth of it, as their constant habit, be clothed with humility. It must appear in your outward carriage. . . . It is seen as a modest man's or woman's apparel, which they wear not for that end, that it may be seen, and do not gaudily flaunt and delight in dressing; though there is a decency as well as necessity, which they do and may have respect to, yet that in so neat and unaffected a way, that they are a good example, even in that point. Thus humility in carriage and words is as the decorum of this clothing, but the main end is the real usefulness of it.—Rebecca's beauty and jewels were covered with a veil; but when they did appear, the veil set them off and commended them, though at a distance it hid them.—O humility! the virtue of Christ, (that which He so peculiarly espoused) how dost thou confound the vanity of our pride!—One says well, "that he who carries other graces without humility, carries a precious powder in wind without a cover."

But He giveth grace.—Pours it out plentifully upon humble hearts. His sweet dews and showers of grace slide off the mountains of pride and fall on the low valleys of humble hearts and make them pleasant and fertile.

Ver. 6. His gracious design is to make much room for grace by much humbling. . . . . It is necessary time and pains that is given to the unballasting of a ship, casting out the earth and sand, when it is to be laden with spices. We must be emptied more, if we would have of that fulness and riches which we are longing for.

Ver. 7. The whole golden mines of all spiritual comfort and good are His, the spirit itself. Then will He not furnish what is fit for thee, if thou humbly attend on Him and lay the care of providing for thee upon His wisdom and love? This were the sure way to honour Him with what we have, and to obtain much of what we have not; for certainly He deals best with those that do most absolutely refer all to Him.

Vv. 8. 9. That we may *watch*, it concerns us to be sober. The instruction is military, and a drunken soldier is not fit to be on the watch.

Ver. 10. As the first, *perfect*, implies more clearly than the rest, their advancement in victory over their remaining corruptions and infirmities and their progress towards perfection. *Stablish* has more express reference to both the inward lightness and inconstancy than is natural to us, the counter-blasts of persecutions and temptatations and to outward oppositions, and imports the curing of the one and support against the other. *Strengthen*, the growth of other graces, especially gaining of further measures of those graces wherein they are weakest and lowest. And *settle*, though it seems the same, and in substance is the same with the other word *stablish*, yet it adds somewhat to it very considerably; for it signifies to found or fix upon a sure foundation, and so indeed may have an aspect to Him who is the *foundation* and strength of believers, on whom they build by faith, even Jesus Christ, in whom we have all both victory over sin and increase of grace, establishment of spirit, and power to persevere against all difficulties and assaults, Is. xxviii. 16; Matt. vii. 24–29.—M.]

[Ver. 5. Beware of the pride of humility. Ver. 7. Most of our cares are either imaginary or about unnecessaries. Faith and trust in God, the infallible remedy for them.—Ver. 8. Our enemy is expert in the variation of his tactics; defeated, he is even more dangerous than victorious. *οὐ δίδωσιν ἀνάπαυσιν, οὐδὲ νικῶν, οὐδὲ νικώμενος*. Plato in *Vita Marcel*.—Ver. 9. The motives to resistance are thus strongly put by Tertullian, *Lib. ad Martyr*, 8: "*Stat conflictus conspector et victoriæ, Agonothetes, Deus vivus: Xystarches, Spiritus Sanctus: Epistates, Christus Jesus: Corona, æternitatis brabium, angelicæ in cœlis substantiæ politia, gloria in secula seculorum.*"—Ver. 10. The God of all grace.—Mohammed heads every surat or chapter (with the exception of one) of the Korân with the words *Bismillahi, arrahmani arraheemi*, signifying, "In the name of the most merciful God," or, as some prefer, "In the name of the God of all grace." Savary says: "This formula is expressly recommended in the Korân. The Mohammedans pronounce it whenever they slaughter an animal, at the commencement of their reading and of all important actions. It is with them that which the sign of the cross is with Christians. Gidab, one of their celebrated authors, says, that when these words were sent down from heaven, the clouds fled on the side of the east, the winds were lulled, the sea was moved, the animals erected their ears to listen, the devils were precipitated from the celestial spheres," etc.—M.]

[Ver. 5. Parkhurst: The original word, here rendered "be clothed," is very beautiful and expressive. It signifies to clothe properly with an outer ornamental garment tied loosely upon the wearer with knots. And it implies, that the humility of Christians, which is one of the most ornamental graces of their profession, should constantly appear in all their conversation, so as to strike the eye of every beholder, and that this amiable grace should be so closely connected with their persons, that no occurrence, temptation or calamity should be able to strip them of it.—M.]

[Ver. 8. Stanhope: *Be sober;* the advice comprises not only a temperate use of the creatures appointed for our sustenance and refreshment, but the government of our passions and desires in general, with respect to any objects or events whatsoever, which in this present life are wont to provoke them to violence and excess.—M.]

CHAPTER V. 12–14.

Analysis:—Remarks on the object of the Apostle's writing, salutations and benediction.

12 By Silvanus, a[1] faithful brother unto you,[2] as I suppose,[3] I have written briefly,[4]
13 exhorting, and testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand.[5] [6]The
church that is at Babylon, elected together with *you*, saluteth you; and *so doth* Mar-
14 cus my son. Greet[7] ye one another with a kiss of charity.[8] Peace *be* with you all
that are in Christ Jesus.[9] Amen.
The first of Peter.[10]

Verse 12. [[1] τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ.—*the* faithful brother.—M.]
[[2] ὑμῖν, not as E. V., "a faithful brother unto you," but dependent on ἔγραψα, "By Silvanus, etc., I have written to you."—M.]
[[3] Better retain the position of ὡς λογίζομαι in the original, and render, "By Silvanus, the faithful brother, as I reckon, etc."—M.]
[[4] δι' ὀλίγων—in (by means of) few words.—M.]
[[5] εἰς ἣν στῆτε. A. B. Cod. Colb. Cod. Sin., so Lachmann and Alford; εἰς ἣν ἑστήκατε—K.L., Tischendorf and others. The weight of authority is on the side of the first. We may render, with E. V., "in which ye stand," or, with Alford, "in which stand ye."—M.]

Verse 13. [[6] ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή—"She that is elected together with you in Babylon;" so German. See note below.—M.]

Verse 14. [[7] Better render ἀσπάσασθε as ἀσπάζεται, v. 13, "salute."—M.]
[[8] A kiss of love.—M.]
[[9] Rec. with K. L., and many versions inserts ἰησοῦ after χριστῷ.—M.]
[[10] The subscription πετρου A. occurs in A. B.; Sin. του αγιου αποςτολου πετρου χαθολιχη επιςτολη α' L.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 12. **By Silvanus—in few words.**—Silvanus is very probably the same as Silas, Acts xv. 22. 27. 32. 34. 40; xvi. 19. 25. 29; xvii. 10. 14; xviii. 5; the companion of St. Paul (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 9). He accompanied the Apostle on his second missionary journey, and was with him at Corinth in A. D. 53. Acts xviii. 5. The statements of Lachmann, that Silvanus and Silas are different persons, cannot be substantiated. See Weiss.—*ὑμῖν* is to be joined with *ἔγραψα*, not with *τοῦ πιστοῦ*, which would require: *-οῦ ὑμῖν πιστοῦ*. Grotius explains *ἔγραψα* of a lost Epistle, but this is quite arbitrary, cf. 2 Pet. iii. 1. I wrote by Silvanus, may mean, I have called in his assistance in writing; this exposition seems to be sustained by the tradition, that Peter was obliged to use an amanuensis; or rather, I send you this Epistle by the hand of Silvanus, so Acts xv. 23, and in the subscriptions of several of Paul's Epistles.—The apposition *τοῦ πιστοῦ*, of the brother faithful to Jesus and the Church, and worthy of all confidence, and the circumstance that v. 13 specifies no salutation from him, favour the latter view. But *ὡς λογίζομαι*, I reckon, I suppose, is decisive. Some connect it with *δι' ὀλιγῶν*: I have written in few words, it seems to me, as I think, considering the importance of the subject. But such an apposition would have been more appropriate in Heb. xiii. 22. Hence others join it with *τοῦ πιστοῦ*, saying that Peter did not know, from personal experience, the fidelity of Silvanus in his peculiar relation to those congregations. Still this would not fail to indicate a problematical opinion of this brother, even though *ὡς λογίζομαι* should be rendered, "as I am fully convinced concerning him," cf. Rom. iii. 28; vi. 11. Beza already remarks, that it is doubtful that Peter should have praised a man, who belonged to the *ἡγουμένοις*, Acts xv. 22, in such vague terms, particularly if he intended to recommend him as the bearer of the Epistle. The most natural exposition is obtained by connecting *ὡς λογίζομαι* with *διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ἔγραψα*, "I calculate that you will receive this Epistle by the hands of Silvanus," which was the less certain since it was designed to pass through the hands of several congregations. If this interpretation is correct, *ἔγραψα διὰ* refers decidedly to the transmission, and not to the composition of the Epistle. [But the above exposition of *ὡς λογίζομαι* as connected with *τοῦ πιστοῦ*, is hardly exhaustive. It seems to be the most natural connection, and indicates, says Alford, the Apostle's judgment concerning Silvanus, given, not in any disparagement of him, nor indicating, as De Wette and Bengel, that he was not known to St. Peter, but as fortifying him in his mission to the churches addressed, with the Apostle's recommendation, over and above the acquaintance which the readers may already have had with him.—M.]

[Wordsworth:—St. Peter avouches to his readers, that St. Paul's fellow-labourer among them, Silas, is "their faithful brother." He calls St. Mark his son, who had once faltered in the faith, but who had afterwards preached to them in Asia (See Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24), and whom St. Paul, writing from Rome to the churches of Phrygia, mentions as being there among his own tried and trusted friends, and calls him "Sister's son to Barnabas."

St. Paul, as well as St. Peter, now also, at the close of his career, writes to Timothy about the same time as the date of this Epistle of St. Peter, and bears witness that Mark "is *profitable to him* for the ministry," (2 Tim. iv. 11). And St. Peter here joins Mark with Silas, who had once been preferred in his room.

So may all wounds be healed, and all differences cease in the Church of Christ. So may all

falterers be recovered, and Christian charity prevail, and God's glory be magnified in all persons and in all things, through Jesus Christ!—M.]

δι ὀλίγων, an expression of modesty, and an exhortation to use the little conscientiously.

Exhorting.—*παρακαλεῖν*, to cheer, encourage and console. This is the main design of the Epistle, and the fulfilment of the charge Christ gave him: "Strengthen thy brethren," Luke xxii. 32.

Testifying.—*ἐπιμαρτυρῶν*.—Bengel refers *ἐπὶ* to the testimony of Paul, which Peter intended to confirm. Without reason. It rather denotes the confirmation of the oral announcement they had received. The result, the substance of all, is contained in what follows.

That this is the true grace of God, viz.: that you have been made partakers of the grace of God truly, and not only imaginarily; that you stand on the right foundation, from which you must not suffer yourselves to be pushed away; see ch. i. 10. 20; ii. 4. By means of the preaching of the Gospel, they had been brought through faith to the possession and enjoyment of the grace of God. Therein they should stand firm and grow, cf. ch. i. 8. 21; ii. 7. 9. 10.—In two ways they might come to doubt if they were right and standing in the grace of God: first, by being surprised at their sufferings, second, by false teachers. "Jewish teachers of the law called in question, 'Whether the Galatians were standing in the true grace of God.' Afterwards other seducers, whom Peter denounces in his second Epistle, may have arisen in those countries, and tried to make those Christians believe that they were not standing in the true grace of God." Roos.

εἰς ἣν ἑστήκατε—in which ye have come to stand and still stand. [See note in Appar. Crit. Fronmüller considers *ἑστήκατε* as most authentic, but the probability is strong that it is a correction from Rom. v. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 2; see Alford. —M.]

VER. 13. **She that is elected together with you in Babylon saluteth you.**—"The design of the salutation which follows is to assure them that other believers have their perseverance in the faith and ultimate salvation greatly at heart."—*ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή*.—The most current exposition is that it denotes a congregation at Babylon, cf. ch. i. 1. So the ancient versions, the fathers and reformers down to the eighteenth century; see Weiss. The view of others, who explain it of Peter's wife or some noble lady at Babylon, has in its favour the circumstance that the names of individuals are mentioned immediately before and after this salutation; but it would be rather singular that Peter should describe his wife or another lady so periphrastically as she that is elected together with you in Babylon. This would require: my coelect (one) who is now in Babylon. 2 Jno. i. 13 probably refers to a congregation. Hofmann. Wiesinger.—Some expositors see in Babylon a reference to Rome, on account of its hostility to Christianity, cf. Rev. xiv. 8; xvii. 5. 18; xviii. 2. 10; others to Jerusalem, and others again to Babylon in Egypt, but which was only a Roman military post. We prefer, with Weiss, the exposition according to which the literal Babylon in Chaldea is meant, although we have no account of a journey of Peter to Babylon. The designation of Rome by the term Babylon seems only to fit a later period, and to be ill-suited to the style of the Epistle and the sending of salutations. According to Schöttgen, the Jews did not begin to call Rome Babylon until after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Marcus, my son.—Probably not his actual son, as we have no information on that head, but his spiritual son, Mark the Evangelist, cf. Acts xii. 12; Col. iv. 10; Phil. xxiv.; 2 Tim. iv. 11; 2 Tim. i. 2; 1 Cor. iv. 15; Gal. iv. 19; Matt. xii. 27. Papias reports him to have been Peter's interpreter, so Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria. But the statements of these fathers do not warrant the inference that the Epistle was written in Rome, as a spurious subscription in several manuscripts declares.

VER. 14. **Salute ye one another in a kiss of love.**—Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26; Rom. xvi. 16. The custom of a holy brotherly kiss was at that time universally observed among Christians. "It was designed to be the seal of His love in whose name they kissed one another, but also the seal of their own mutual love, for without taking its existence for granted such a charge could hardly have been given." Wiesinger. [For a full account of this custom, see Winer, *Real-Wörterbuch*, s. v. Kuss. —M.]

Peace—Amen.—*εἰρήνη*, see ch. i. 2; Rom. xvi. 24; Eph. vi. 23. 24; 3 Jno. 15. It is the peace flowing from grace. It is enjoyed only by those who are in Christ Jesus, but by *all* thus situated, 1 Cor. i. 3; Phil. i. 2; Col. i. 2.—*ἀμήν* is wanting in many manuscripts.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Which are the infallible marks of the state of grace? "It is a great guilt to make those who stand in the true grace of God doubt their state of grace, or at least to endeavour to make them believe that they will always remain beginners in Christianity, because, forsooth, they are unwilling to castigate their bodies with some uncommonly hard discipline, to join some peculiar party, and to receive some uncommonly high and profound wisdom of which that party, without any warrant of Holy Writ, makes boast, cf. Gal. v. 10; i. 8. 9; 2. Pet. iii. 17, 18." Roos.

STARKE:—Believers stand ever in need both of instruction and exhortation to constancy under the cross in the course of Christianity, Prov. ix. 9.—Many a one may imagine himself to stand in grace, though he is under wrath and losing his hope. How much depends upon one's being found in the true grace of God, and of being vitally assured thereof both inwardly and outwardly, 2 Tim. iii. 5.—It was a custom of long duration that each sex, male and female separately, kissed, Lke. vii. 45. 46. Peace and Christ, the Prince of Peace, go together.—Whoso desireth peace, must be in Christ. Whoso is in Him has true peace with all the blessings of salvation forever and ever, Jno. xvi. 33.

Lisco:—Do you stand in the grace of God?

[Leighton:—To testify the true grace of God—the end of our preaching.—M.]

[Neander:—"The fraternal kiss with which every one, after being baptized, was received into the community, by the Christians into whose immediate fellowship he entered — which the members bestowed on each other just before the celebration of the Communion, and with which every Christian saluted his brother, though he never saw him before—was not an empty form, but the expression of Christian feelings, a token of the relation in which Christians conceived themselves to stand to each other. It was this, indeed, which, in a cold and selfish age, struck the Pagans with wonder: to behold men of different countries, ranks, stages of culture, so intimately bound together; to see the stranger who came into a city, and by his letter of recognition (his *Epistola formata*) made himself known to the Christians of the place as a brother beyond suspicion, finding at once among them to whom he was personally unknown all manner of brotherly sympathy and protection."—M.]

THE

SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. OBJECT OF THE EPISTLE.

THIS Epistle is designed to be a hortatory memorial addressed to believers, standing and already established in the truth, as appears plainly from ch. i. 12. 15. The first Epistle deals with warnings against dangers and enemies from without; the second warns Christians against the more dangerous enemies from within, and exhorts them to vigilance and resistance to the deceivers and scoffers, who had gradually crept into the Christian churches. "Beware, lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness," (ch. iii. 17).—"Use with all diligence the received gifts of grace to the furthering of your holiness," ch. i. 3, etc. The rich contents of the Epistle concentrate in this exhortation. The motives to a holy life, are chiefly taken from the consideration of the nearness of the coming of Christ and the catastrophes connected with that event, ch. iii. 11, etc. The deceivers against whom Peter warns his readers, are described not so much intellectually as morally. They are men of the Sadducee cast of mind, libertines, antinomists, living in uncleanness, unrighteousness and covetousness, according to the promptings of their own lusts, ch. ii. 10. 3. 14, some of whom scoffed at the truth, and particularly at the coming of Christ, ch. iii. 3. 4, etc. They used great swelling words of vanity, spoke evil of dignities and the celestial powers, and derided the Lord that bought them, ch. ii. 1. 18. 10. Their wisdom consisted in lying, blaspheming, and the promise of unbridled licence, ch. ii. 19. Here we may discern the roots of the antinomistic Gnosis, which afterwards was maintained by Carpocrates, Epiphanes, Prodicus, the Simonians, the Antitactes, and others. Similar errors are referred to by Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 1; vi. 20; 2 Tim. iii. 1, etc.; cf. Rev. ii. 14. 15. 20. The author predicts their appearance, and prophetically sees them already extant, ch. ii. 1, etc.; 10, etc. Their false knowledge is opposed by the vital knowledge of Christ, on which great stress is laid in this Epistle, ch. i. 2. 3. 8; ii. 20.

§ 2. CONTENTS AND ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle consists of two parts: the first, ch. i. 1–21; the second, from ch. ii. 1—iii. 18. Each of these parts are again divided into two sections. In the first section of the first part, ch. i. 2—11, the Apostle reminds his readers of the great and precious riches and promises which had been vouchsafed to them on the part of God, and exhorts them on their part to comply with the demand of the Divine Will, and to make their calling and election sure. In the second section, ch. i. 12–21, he specifies the motive which then constrained him to exhort them, viz., the near-

ness of his decease; he then, v. 16, etc., confirms the truth of the doctrine in which they had been instructed: 1. By the fact that he and all the Apostles had been eye-witnesses of the works of Jesus; 2. By the testimony of prophecy. In the first section of the second part, he announces the speedy appearance of false prophets, gives a brief sketch of their character and conduct, and adverts, by way of warning, to three examples, to show that their wickedness would surely be punished, ch. ii. 1–10, the examples being, the case of the fallen angels, the case of those who perished in the waters of the flood, and the case of Sodom and Gomorrah. Then follows the more specific description of their thorough carnality, their presumptuousness, their spirit of rebellion and blasphemy, their brutal want of reason, their licentiousness, their perseverance in evil, their covetousness, their seductive arts, their vaunting with all their nothingness and emptiness, their perverseness, obduracy and perdition, v. 10–22. The fiery flow of prophetical utterance having found a point of rest, the Apostle, in the second section, resumes at ch. i. 15, states the design of his writing still more clearly than in ch. i. 15, to be the stirring up of their pure minds. He refers to a still more dangerous class of enemies of Christ, to mockers, who scoff at the coming of Christ and the events connected with it, and who in their Epicurean bias are on a level with the former, ch. iii. 1–5. He then refutes the vain reason they assign for their denial of the coming of Christ, by the fact of the flood (v. 5–7), followed by the instruction given to believers, that the heavens and the earth will be destroyed by fire in a fearful catastrophe, and that the apparent delay of judgment should be considered as an act of the long-suffering of God, v. 7–10. Then follows, for the edification of believers, the announcement of the Lord's coming, and of the mighty events connected with it, especially the establishment of new heavens and a new earth. With this is connected an earnest exhortation to holiness of life, v. 10–15. He strengthens the weight of his exhortations by a reference to the Epistles of Paul, with whom he professes himself thoroughly to agree, while those destroyers of the peace of the Churches probably maintained that Peter and Paul were at variance with each other, v. 15. 16. In conclusion, he exhorts them not to suffer themselves to be moved from their stedfastness by the error of wicked men, but to grow in grace and the knowledge of Jesus Christ, as a chief means for the conservation of the faith. Lastly, a doxology to Christ.

§ 3. GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

The authenticity of no writing of the New Testament has been so much denied and doubted in ancient and modern times, as that of this Epistle. Modern critics consider it proven, that a pseudo-Peter of a later period clumsily manufactured this Epistle from that of Jude. Misled by their confident assertions, even circumspect investigators have here and there assented to this result.

Beginning with the *external testimonies* of this Epistle, we have the fact that it was ecclesiastically acknowledged as part of the Canon in the fourth century, (Guerike, *Gesammtgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, p. 477. 615). Going backwards from this fixed point of time, we find that Jerome considered it genuine, observing, however, that it was generally held to be spurious on account of the difference of its style from the First. Eusebius, it is well known, reckons it among the *Antilegomena*, describes it as not included in the then received Canon of the Church, although many considered it profitable, and used it along with the other Scriptures. Origen says: Peter has left an Epistle which is universally acknowledged; perhaps (ἔστω δὲ) also a second, for it is doubted—one is not agreed about it. He cites, however, the second Epistle as part of the Holy Scriptures in several passages, cf. Dietlein, p. 61, etc. The Syriac version, the Peschito, which originated at the latest in the third century, does not contain it; it is not known on what grounds. It is also wanting in the Muratorian Canon, which however does not mention the first Epistle and other Epistles of the New Testament. Tertullian and Cyprian do not mention it; Eusebius states that Clement of Alexandria wrote a commentary on it and other *Antilegomena*. Justin and Irenæus probably allude to 2 Peter iii. 8; the latter also to 2 Peter ii. 4–6, and the former also to 2 Peter ii. 1. Theophilus of Antioch seems to refer to 2 Peter i. 19. 21; iii. 3. The Epistle of Hermas, about the middle of the second century, contains almost undeniable references to 2 Pet. ii. 15. 20. 22; iii. 3; i. 5–8. In Barnabas, whose Epistle perhaps reaches down to the end

of the first century, Dietlein perceives several allusions, the clearest of which is that to 2 Peter iii. 8, which is however not certain, because this saying occurs also in the Mishnah. In Clement of Rome, Dietlein discovers massive proofs, by which this author testifies in favour of our Epistle even before the destruction of Jerusalem. A certain affinity of language cannot be denied, but the citations of Dietlein, among which the expression of ἡ μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα is the most weighty, will hardly do more than carry conviction to the minds of those who are already sure of the genuineness of the Epistle. The same applies to the Epistle of Polycarp. Huther justly maintains that not a single sentence is cited literally from 2 Peter, as is the case with 1 Peter. Nor can Ignatius be proved to be dependent on 2 Peter, although there are several distant allusions. It follows, from the preceding data, that the Epistle was used about the middle of the second century; that the earliest fathers cannot be proved to have used it; that it gave rise to doubts in the third century, which however arose on *internal* grounds; and that its genuineness was established by the Church at the end of the fourth century. The supposition of Thiersch is altogether inadequate, that fears were entertained that too early a disclosure of the whole form of the evil, as given in the thunder-words of Peter, might have exerted a soliciting influence on the evil, and even on its manifestation in that time, which was shaken to all the depths of the spiritual world (that is, the time when the Canon of the *Homologoumena* was fixed). Now, since no certain result can be arrived at from external evidence, which however rather favours than disfavours the genuineness of our Epistle, we are so much the more dependent,

Secondly, on *internal evidence*, under which head we have to offer the following remarks:

1. We encounter in the Epistle a person concerning whom we feel that he stands in the grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ, that he loves truth above all things, ch. i. 3; iii. 18; i. 12; that he has received the forgiveness of sins, and along with it, a Divine vital energy, ch. i. 9. 10. 2; that he is thoroughly in earnest about Christianity, ch. i. 5, etc.; iii. 14. 17; that he has personal intercourse with Christ Jesus, ch. i. 14; that he looks stedfastly at His coming, and hastens to meet the coming of His day, ch. iii. 12; that he fears the judgments of eternity, ch. ii. 1, etc., and is penetrated with the sense of the superintending justice of God, ch. ii. 9; that he cultivates with all diligence a holy conversation and a godly life, and feels constrained to oppose fine-spun fables with the severity of truth, ch. ii. 16. This spirit, thus enlightened and animated with the earnestness of Christianity, calls himself Simon Peter, a Servant and an Apostle of Jesus Christ, ch. i. 1; iii. 2; he speaks in the spirit of prophecy, ch. ii. 1, etc.; iii. 3; he specifies details of his life, that he had been an eye-witness of Christ's transfiguration on the holy mount, ch. i. 16, etc., that Jesus had revealed to him the nearness of His death, ch. i. 14; he describes himself as the brother and colleague of the Apostle Paul, with whose Epistles he professes fully to agree, ch. iii. 15. 16, and considers it his duty to remind, strengthen and stir up the believers to whom he writes, ch. i. 12, etc.; iii. 1. 2. His doctrines, exhortations, confessions, testimonies and warnings are full of power and fire, full of firm assurance and glowing zeal for the honour of the Lord, full of emphasis and originality. If Peter is really the author of this Epistle, every thing is in glorious harmony; if he is not, we have before us an insoluble psychological riddle. Is it possible, we are constrained to ask, that a man, animated through and through with the spirit of Christianity, who expressly renounces all cunning fabrications, should have set up for the Apostle Peter, and have written this Epistle in his name? Intentional fraud and such illumination—who is able to reconcile them?

2. If, as many critics superficially assume, a deceiver did father this Epistle upon Peter, he must have done so with some evil intention. But where is there any thing in this Epistle that could possibly be construed into an error, or a moral impurity? On the supposition that the object was the mediation between the Apostles of the Jews and the Apostles of the Gentiles, the alleged antithesis unfortunately resolves itself into a fiction (see a citation from Clement of Rome, in Dietlein, p. 30. 31), and the contents of the Epistle, in that case, ought to be very different from what they are. An otherwise honest man would not have ventured to place the name of the Apostle at the head of his writing for the purpose of attacking false teachers (Olshausen, *Nachweis der Æchtheit, etc.*, p. 124).

3. A forger would not have omitted to designate with greater precision the readers for whom the Epistle was written, while the author with the utmost ingenuousness addresses those who

have obtained the like precious faith, and expects to meet the same class of readers as in the first Epistle.

4. The second Epistle is an integrant part of the first, which deals with *external* enemies, while the second Epistle cautions against *internal* adversaries of the truth. The two cannot well be separated from each other.

5. The doctrinal contents of the second Epistle essentially agree with the first in the conception of Christianity as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, ch. i. 19–21, and in the prominence given to the coming of Christ, as we have seen in the Apostle of hope in the first Epistle, ch. iii. 10, etc. The second Epistle is not inferior to the first in spirit, power, vivacity and glowing zeal against evil, in originality and wealth of thought, and no production of the second century can compare with it in this respect. Compare the Shepherd of Hermas with the second Epistle of Peter—what a contrast! How beautiful, in particular, is the opening of the Epistle, which introduces us at once into the whole plenitude of evangelical grace! The mode of representation in the two Epistles exhibits also many points of agreement, *e. g.*, the connection of sentences by means of participles and the choice of particular expressions. Thus, Guerike mentions the words *ἀναστροφή*, 1 Peter i. 15. 18; ii. 12; iii. 1. 2. 16; cf. 2 Peter ii. 7; iii. 11.— *ἀπόθεσις*, 1 Peter iii. 21; cf. 2 Peter i. 14.—*ἀρετή*, 1 Peter ii. 9; cf. 2 Peter i. 3.—*ἀλήθεια*, in a peculiar sense, 1 Peter i. 22; cf. 2 Peter i. 12.—*κομίζεσθαι*, 1 Peter i. 9; v. 4; cf. 2 Peter ii. 13.—*ἐποπτεύειν*, 1 Peter ii. 12; iii. 2; cf. 2 Peter i. 16.—*ἄσπιλος* and *ἄμωμος*, 1 Peter i. 19; cf. 2 Peter iii. 14.—On *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας*, cf. 1 Peter iv. 1; cf. 2 Peter ii. 12.

6. The Epistle, if written by Peter, admirably fits in the history of the development of the Christian Church. This has been well brought out by Thiersch, who says: "Supposing the Epistle were not the production of Peter, it cannot, because of the sum-total of its contents, belong to any other period of history than to that of that great catastrophe, the mighty breaking forth of an unparalleled wicked Gentile Gnosis, which was posterior to the ministry of Paul, and anterior to that of John."

7. The objections raised on internal grounds *against* the Epistle, are not of great moment.

a. It is alleged that *ἐλπίς* is the leading idea of the first Epistle, while *ἐπίγνωσις* predominates in the latter. This is the natural consequence of the different tendencies of the two Epistles. Is it probable that both would move in the same fundamental ideas?

b. That the day of Christ's coming is expected in the first as about to take place immediately, while the author of the second Epistle adverts not so much to its *nearness* as to its *suddenness*. This may be accounted for by the comparatively early date of the composition of the first Epistle. See Introduction to 1 Peter.

c. That the idea of Christ's advent in the second Epistle is altogether kept in the back-ground of that of the final destruction of the world. This is quite correct, according to ch. iii. 10, and the second Epistle completes in this respect the discourses of the first.

d. That in the first Epistle the redemptive acts of the death and resurrection of Christ are described as the groundwork of the Christian life, whereas they are not mentioned in the second. Evidently because the caution against seducers is the tendency of the second Epistle, which presupposes those redemptive acts.

e. That the ideas of communion with the Divine nature, of the origin of the world out of water, and that of its destruction by fire, are peculiar to the second Epistle. But there is no reason why there should not be ideas peculiar to this Epistle.

f. That faith in the second Epistle stands in the back-ground, and knowledge in the foreground. This is the necessary adjunct of the controversy with the adherents of the false Gnosis, and said *ἐπίγνωσις* does not differ materially from *πίστις*.

g. De Wette says, that Κύριος is applied, ch. iii. 10, to God. But this is also occasionally the case in the first Epistle, 1 Peter iii. 12. 15.

h. That the heretical denial of the coming of Christ, and the view of the origin and destruction of the world, are surprising and, as Neander thinks, not in keeping with the practical, simple mind of Peter and the doctrinal development of the New Testament. But even Huther is constrained to pronounce this a purely subjective opinion.

i. The diversity of style in the two Epistles, which were already alleged in ancient times

are not very important and counterbalanced by the aforementioned, obvious coincidences of language. Even if they were greater than they are, we might assume, with Jerome, that Peter used different amanuenses in the composition of the two Epistles. See Olshausen, p. 118.

k. That 2 Peter iii. 15, seems to assume that a collection of the Epistles of St. Paul was already circulating in the Church. But the reference here is not to a *complete* collection of his writings.

l. Neander raises the doubt, that the author assumes a different relation to his readers, in the second Epistle, from that which existed between them in the first, for according to the second Epistle they must have been personally instructed by the Apostle; but in the interval between the dates of the two Epistles, a closer personal relation between them may easily have sprung up.

Thus all these objections and doubts are not sufficiently weighty to upset the above argument for the genuineness of the Epistle.

[A very excellent digest of this section, with full citations of the authorities, may be seen in Alford's *Prolegomena*, Vol. IV., Part I.—M.]

§ 4. RELATION OF THIS EPISTLE TO THAT OF JUDE.

The second chapter of the present Epistle to the beginning of the third chapter, and the Epistle of Jude, exhibit so remarkable an agreement, that the dependence of the one Epistle on the other is undeniable, cf. Jude 4. 6–13. 16, with 2 Peter ii. 1. 4. 6. 10–13. 15. 17. 18; Jude 17. 18, with 2 Peter iii. 2. 3. The view which makes the Epistle of Jude the original that was used by the author of the second Epistle of Peter, stated by Herder, has become dominant in modern times. This is the view of De Wette, Guerike, Huther and Kurz, who allege that the language of Jude is more simple than that in 2 Peter, and that many passages in the latter cannot be thoroughly understood without the light derived from the Epistle of Jude. But that assumption is opposed on weighty grounds, by Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*), Thiersch, Stier and Dietlein. It is rightly contended, that at the time of the composition of the Epistle of Jude, the false teachers had already *appeared*, whereas in the second Epistle of Peter their appearance is simply *predicted*, ch. ii. 1, etc.; and that the second Epistle of Peter is free from the apparently apocryphal elements contained in that of Jude. Dietlein attempts to prove the originality of the second Epistle of Peter in every respective passage; and although he has not always succeeded, we can hardly withhold our assent in some passages. Those who, like ourselves, are profoundly impressed with the authenticity of the second Epistle of Peter, deem it *a priori* highly improbable that Peter, the Prince of Apostles,—that illumined and highly-gifted man, who proves his originality in the first Epistle as well as in 2 Peter i. and iii.,—should have borrowed, in a part of his Epistle, the language, figures and examples of a man evidently less gifted than himself. Especially remarkable, moreover, would be his silence concerning Jude, seeing that he made mention of Paul and his Epistles. If we add to this the fact that the second Epistle is rich in peculiar expressions, that the three chapters contain more than twenty *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, that the Epistle of Jude expressly refers to the words of the Apostles, v. 17, and specifies that it was quickly composed to meet a particular emergency, v. 3, the hypothesis that Jude made use of the second Epistle of Peter, is more probable than that Peter made use of the Epistle of Jude. We call particular attention to the word *ἐμπαῖκται*, Jude 18; cf. 2 Peter iii. 3, which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament.

[Those who wish to study this question in all its bearings, are referred to Brückner's Excursus on 2 Peter ii., in his edition of De Wette's *Handbuch*, Vol. I., Part III., pp. 163–170, who maintains the priority of St. Jude and St. Peter's acquaintance with his Epistle, but vindicates the independence of the latter; to Huther's Appendix to his Commentary on the Epistle, Davidson, Introduction, etc., Vol. III., pp. 399–408. Alford, in his *Prolegomena* to this Epistle, Section 3, pronounces for the priority of St. Jude. Wordsworth reaches the opposite conclusion, which is also the opinion of Oecumenius, Estius, Mill, Benson, Witsius, Dodwell, Lenfant, Beausobre, Hengstenberg and Heydenreich, besides the authors named by Fronmüller. For convenience' sake, I have given the most important parallel passages in the Introduction to St. Jude's Epistle, to which the reader is referred.—M.]

§ 5. DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

Mayerhoff undertakes to prove that it was composed by a Jewish Christian at Alexandria, about the middle of the second century. Schwegler considers the end of the second century to be the earliest date of its origin. Huther ascribes it to the beginning of the second century. This disagreement among critics entirely ignores, first, that the intellectual strength which characterizes this Epistle, is not found elsewhere in the second century; and secondly, that the appearance of the seducers, against whom this Epistle is directed, coincides, according to the notices found in the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul and in the Revelation of St. John, with the very period to which the Epistle, which must have been written shortly before his death, introduces us. "At the beginning of the second period of the Apostolical age, the Gentile Gnostic apostacy broke out with gigantic energy in the Churches of Asia. Paul had finished his work, but Peter was still destined to raise his warning voice before the end of his life." Thiersch.

§ 6. LITERATURE.

The same works specified in the Introduction to the first Epistle, viz.: those of GERHARD, CALOV, RIEGER, STARKE, DE WETTE, HUTHER, and particularly DIETLEIN, *Second Epistle of Peter*, 1851.

[*De argumento epist. Petri posterioris et Judæ Catholicarum*, in CRIT. SACR. *Thes. Nov.* II., 982.

BP. SHERLOCK: *The Authority of the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, Works, IV., 137.

SIMPSON: *Commentary on 2 Peter*. 4to. London, 1632.

ADAMS, THOMAS: *A Commentary on the Second Epistle of Peter*. London, 1633. Folio. Imp. 8vo., 1839.

SMITH, THOMAS: *A Commentary on the Second Epistle of Peter*.

LILLIE, JOHN, D.D.: *The Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistles of John and Judas, and the Revelation*. Translated from the Greek, with Notes. New York, 1854.

Separate treatises, expositions and sermons will be referred to in the Commentary.—M.]

COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.[1]

CHAPTER I. 1–11.

ANALYSIS:—The brotherly salutation and prayer of blessing (v. 1. 2) are followed by the exhortation: Forasmuch as God richly furnishes you with whatever is necessary for your spiritual life, do ye also furnish whatever is agreeable to His will; then the entrance to His kingdom shall be opened to you.

1 Simon[1] Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained
like precious faith with us through[2] the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus
2 Christ: Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and
3 of Jesus[3] our Lord, According as his divine power hath given unto us all things[4] that
pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to
4 glory and virtue:[5] Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious[6] pro-
mises; that by these ye might be partakers[7] of the divine nature, having escaped[8] the
5 corruption that is in the world through lust. And besides this,[9] giving all diligence,
6 add to your faith virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; And to knowledge, temperance;
7 and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; And to godliness, brotherly
8 kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you,[10] and
abound, they make *you that ye shall* neither *be* barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge
9 of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot
10 see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.[11] Wherefore
the rather, brethren, give diligence[12] to make[13] your calling[14] and election sure: for
11 if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: For so an entrance[15] shall be ministered unto
you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

TITLE. [1 Steph. επιστολη πετρου καθολικη δευτερα: Elz: πετρ. του αποστ. επιστ. καθ. δευτερα: επιστολη καθολικη δευτ.—του αγιου αποστολου πετρου. G. al.—πετρου επιστ. β'. C:—πετρου επιστ. δευτερα Cod. Mosq. πετρου β. A. B. Cod. Sin.—M.]

Verse 1. Lachmann, Tischend. Ed. 7, reads Συμεὼν with A. G. K. and the majority of Codd., cf. Luke iii. 30; vii. 40; Rev. vii. 7; Acts xv. 14; Heb. שִׁמְעוֹן.

[German: . . . . in the righteousness of our God, and of the Saviour Jesus Christ.—M.]

[2 εἰς δικαιοσύνην τ. κυρίου. Cod. Sin.—M.]

Verse 2. [3 ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ A. Cod. Sin. al.—M.] Tisch. omits τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ.

[German: Grace and peace happen to you more and more richly, in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord.

Translate: Grace to you and peace be multiplied in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord.—M.]

Verse 3. [4 τὰ πάντα A. Cod. Sin.—M.]

[4a πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ (4 a improb. τ. θ. κ., Tisch.) ζωὴν Cod. Sin.—M.]

[5 ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ A. C. Cod. Sin.—M.] Lachm. Tisch.

[German: Forasmuch as His divine power hath given us all things which are necessary for life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him that called us by His glory and Divine virtue.

Translate: . . . . By His own glory and virtue.—M.]

Verse 4. [6 τίμ. ἡμῖν καὶ μέγιστ. B. Cod. Sin. al. Rec. ἡμῖν before καὶ τίμια, with Cod. Mosq., Cod. Angel. Rom.; μέγ. καὶ τίμια ἡμῖν A. B. C.—M.]
[7 φύσεως κοινωνοὶ Cod. Sin.—M.]
[8 τὴν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμίαν Cod. Sin.; τῷ before κόσμῳ A. B. Cod. Angel. Rom.; ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ C.—M.]
[German: Through which He hath given unto us the greatest and most precious promises, that by means of these ye might become partakers of the Divine nature, having escaped from the corruption in lust which is in the world.
Translate: . . . . the corruption which is in the world in lust.—M.]

Verse 5. [9 δὲ τοῦτο Cod. Sin.; αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο C**; αὐτοὶ δὲ A; καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ Rec.—M.]
[German: But for this very reason use all your diligence, and present in your faith manly courage, in courage discrimination.
Translate: . . . . giving on your side (Alford) all diligence, furnish in your faith virtue, and in your virtue knowledge.—M.]

Verse 6. [German: In discrimination, self-control, and in self-control, stedfastness. . . . .
Translate: . . . . in self-control endurance. . . . .—M.]

Verse 7. [German: In godliness brotherly love, and in brotherly love universal charity.—M.]

Verse 8. [10 ἡμῶν C.—M.]
[German: For where these things are found in you and abound, they will not let you be idle or unfruitful for the knowledge. . . . .
Translate: For these things being yours (Lillie) and multiplying, render you not idle nor yet unfruitful for (De Wette, Alford). . . . .—M.]

Verse 9. [11 ἁμαρτημάτων A. Cod. Sin. Cod. Mosq.—M.]
[German: For he to whom these things are not present, is blind, not seeing afar off, having placed in forgetfulness the purification of his former sins.
Translate: For he that lacketh these things is blind, short-sighted, having incurred forgetfulness (Alford). . . . .—M.]

Verse 10. [12 σπουδ. ἵνα διὰ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων Cod. Sin.; same addition with further ὑμῶν A. Vulg. Syr. al.—M.] ἵνα διὰ τῶν καλῶν ὑμῶν ἔργων βεβ. Lachmann.
[13 ποιεῖσθε A.—M.] ποιῆσθε, Lachmann.
[14 παράκλησιν A.—M.]
[German: . . . . ye shall never stumble.—M.]

Verse 11. [15 εἴσοδος without the Article.—M.]
[German: For thus shall be richly presented to you the entrance into the . . . .
Translate: . . . . richly furnished. . . . .—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **Simon Peter.**—The opening of the first Epistle has only Peter. It seems that he uniformly bore the name of Simon only while he continued to accompany Jesus till after His ascension; at least Jesus always called him Simon, Matt. xvii. 25; Mark xiv. 37; Luke xxii. 31; John xxi. 15. 16. 17. The disciples also appear to have called him Simon, Luke xxiv. 34; Acts xv. 14. Afterwards they began to distinguish him from others of the same name by the honourable surname Peter, Acts x. 5. 18. The Evangelists call him more frequently Peter than Simon Peter; in the Pauline Epistles Peter is already the constant form; in the Gospels the two names are sometimes used alternately, John xiii. 36. 37; cf. Matt. iv. 18; x. 2; xvi. 16; xvii. 25.—It is improbable that the conjoining of both names denotes on the part of Peter the design of describing merely his natural and his new birth. There is more probability in Besser's suggestion, "that the full name, Simon Peter, has a kind of testamentary form," for he was near his life's end.

[Simon, or rather *Simeon*, Συμεών, שִׁמְעוֹן, cf. Acts. xv. 14. The Aramaic form of Simon seems to favour the view, that this Epistle was addressed to *Jewish* Christians. Alford remarks, that the occurrence of this form is at all events a testimony in favour of the independence of the second Epistle. It was not *adapted* to the first: which, considering that it *refers* to the first, is a note, however slight, on the side of its genuineness.—M].

A Servant and Apostle of Jesus Christ.—The same designation is used by St. Paul, Rom. i. 1; Titus i. 1; and St. James also calls himself a servant of Christ, one of the highest titles of honour, ch. i. 1; cf. Gal. i. 10. The former denotes his relation of dependence; the latter, the dignity of his office.

To them that have obtained like precious faith with us: τοῖς λαχοῦσι sc. χαίρειν λέγει. λαγχάνω=I obtain by lot, by fortune, by Divine appointment, or by inheritance, cf. Luke i. 9; John xix. 24; Acts i. 17. The word excludes all personal agency and merit.—**Faith** may here be taken objectively or subjectively, either as a cycle of truths believed, or as a definite disposition of faith; the former agrees better with λαγχάνω and ἰσότιμος, and accords with παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ, v. 12, cf. Jude 3. Every faith and every construction of the truths of faith are not of equal value; there are inadequate and adequate, light and weighty representations of the Divine truths. But Peter here assures his readers that the faith, which in the dispensation of God was communicated to them, is equal in value and weight to that confessed by him and the other Apostles, cf. Acts xi. 17; xv. 9. 11. The consideration of these passages seems to convey the idea that Peter is here addressing Gentile Christians. — ἡμῖν, elliptically for τῇ ἡμῶν πίστει, Winer, 6 ed., p. 645, equal in value to our faith. [Hornejus: "*Dicitur fides æque pretiosa, non quod omnium credentium æque magna sit, sed quod per fidem illam eadem mysteria et eadem beneficia divina nobis proponantur.*" The references to *Acts* are hardly necessary; whoever they were, *Jewish* or *Gentile* Christians, their faith, says Peter, is equally precious in the sight of God with his (Peter's) faith and that of the other Apostles.—M].

In the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.—This clause also favours the objective construction of faith. Its centre and foundation are in the righteousness of God. Gerlach and Dietlein maintain that "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" are here intimately connected, so that Jesus is called God. But seeing that the Petrine doctrine calls Jesus Lord, but in no other place except this, God, the former is more correctly applied to the Father. But what is the righteousness of God and that of the Saviour? We must here distinguish two sub-

jects. So Huther, δικαιοσύνη derived by Aristotle from δίχα, διχάζειν, to divide in two equal parts, to appoint to each his own. δίκαιος, one who sustains a right relation to others, who is just what he ought to be. צַדִּיק applied to the judge or king who protects and administers justice, hence frequently used of the judicial acts of God as evidenced in the salvation and reward of the godly, and in the punishment of the ungodly. This is often expressed by the terms צְדָקָה, צֶדֶק, which sometimes denote truth and goodness. Here it is clearly not to be taken, as in Rom i. 17, in the sense of righteousness which comes from God and is valid before Him, *i. e.*, imputed righteousness; this, to say nothing of its being an essentially Pauline idea, is impossible on account of the following *καὶ σωτῆρος*. It is rather to be taken as an attribute of God, as it occurs in Rom. iii. 25. 26, descriptive of the judicial activity of God. The manner how Peter understood its manifestation in the centre of our faith, viz., in the work of redemption, is not further indicated in our passage. But we may doubtless infer from ch. ii. 1, where the term "to buy" is used, that his conception is the same as in Rom. iii. 25, that Jesus satisfied the justice of God, which demands the death of the sinner, by paying a sufficient ransom for all mankind. This required Jesus to be perfectly sinless and holy. This is the *δικαιοσύνη σωτῆρος*; so that the word bears a double sense, applicable to the righteousness of God and to the holiness of Jesus. That our passage is closely connected with the doctrine of Paul, seems almost unmistakable, and is not surprising in consideration of the passage ch. iii. 15. Huther takes *δικαιοσύνη*=the conduct corresponding to His holiness, which makes no difference between the one party and the other; de Wette incorrectly=grace and love. [Winer, p. 142, has fully shown that *τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος* I. X. may be grammatically rendered "*of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ*"; Bp. Middleton, p. 595, also asserts that "this passage is plainly and unequivocally to be understood as an assumption that Jesus Christ is our *God* and Saviour." The ostensible design of the Epistle to refute the errors of those who separated *Jesus* from *Christ*, and *denied the Lord that bought them*, and rejected the doctrine of His divinity, supports this construction. See more in Wordsworth.—M.]

Ver. 2 contains the salutation of blessing, as 1 Pet. i. 1; but further specified by *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει*, a stronger expression than the simple *γνῶσις*, and of frequent occurrence in this Epistle, vv. 3. 8; ch. ii. 20. Paul often uses it, especially in the Epistle to the Colossians, ch. i. 9. 10; ii. 2; iii. 10; also Rom. i. 28: iii. 20; x. 3; Eph. i. 17; iv. 13; Phil. i. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 4; vi. 20; Tit. i. 1; Phil. 6; Heb. x. 26.—It deserves to be particularly noticed because of the tendency to false gnosis, which was then beginning to appear. The word denotes acknowledgment, a knowledge which enters into an object and takes affectionate cognizance thereof; which is not satisfied with a merely outward relation to it, but seeks to enter into and to lay hold of that object. The verb is also found in the Gospels; *e. g.*, Matt. vii. 16; xi. 27; xiv. 35; Mk. ii. 8; Luke i. 4. Calov defines it correctly as "practical, confiding knowledge=faith." He adds, that it contains a gentle caution against their forfeiting grace and peace by sins against their conscience or by apostasy. The gifts of God presuppose not only a vessel to receive them, but an advance on our part. *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει*, it is the medium and vehicle of the multiplication of grace. *τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ*; Ἰησοῦ does not require the Article, because the Father and the Son are one in Essence.

Ver. 3. Here begins the Epistle proper, which, as Roos observes, may be compared to a stream which is wide and deep at its very source. In this it resembles the first Epistle. Vv. 3. 4, show what God does for believers, vv. 5–8, what they are expected to do. Gerlach: "The beginning of the Epistle is peculiarly full of fire and life, and translates us forthwith into the whole plenitude of Gospel grace."

Forasmuch as His Divine power hath given us all things; *ὡς—δεδωρημένης*. Grotius connects *ὡς* with the preceding, and explains that he did not value that knowledge so highly for nothing, forasmuch as it is the means whereby the Divine Power communicates all things to us; but it is better to connect *ὡς* with Calov with what follows. *ὡς* is not pleonastic, but denotes here, as frequently elsewhere, a well founded assurance; so De Wette, Dietlein, Huther. One might therefore translate: "Assured that the Divine Power has given us all things, strive," cf. 1 Cor. iv. 18; Acts xxvii. 30; Winer, p. 639.—*δεδωρημένης*, from the *Middle δωρέομαι*, not as if the *perf. passivi* were used instead of the *perf. activi*. Winer, p. 277. So LXX. Gen. xxx. 20. *αὐτοῦ* refers both to Θεοῦ and Ἰησοῦ.

His Divine Power.—The Holy Ghost is not any more referred to here than in Eph. i. 19, although the Holy Ghost is described as "power from on high," Lke. xxiv. 49; cf. Acts i. 5, and He is usually the medium whereby God bestows grace. **Which are** (*necessary*) **for the** (*true spiritual*) **life**, which is planted through regeneration, for the life emanating from God, **and for** the evidences of the same, for the exhibition **of godliness.** Gerlach: "The Divine Power has given us all things necessary for regeneration and holiness, so that the Christian has no excuse." Bengel: "Look, it is not only by piety that we attain life, the Divine glory brings life, the Divine power godliness, to the one is opposed destruction, to the other lust (v. 4.)"

Through the knowledge of Him that called us.—Here, as in v. 2, believing knowledge is the medium of the attainment of the Divine communications of life.

That called us, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9; i. 15; 2 Pet. 1. 10. The calling of God is the *temporal* fulfilment of the PRE-*temporal* [eternal—M.] act of election. The end of the calling is not indicated here; where it is not mentioned, as in 1 Pet. ii. 21; iii. 9, we may supply it, as importing eternal salvation and glory, 1 Pet. 5. 10; cf. 1 Thess. ii. 12; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. i. 9; Heb. ix. 15.

By His glory and virtue.—*διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς*. [The reading *ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ* given in *Appar. Crit.*, which see, is the most authentic. *ἴδιος*=*suus* is peculiar to Peter; cf. ii 22; iii. 3. 16. 17; 1 Pet. iii. 1. 5. Athanasius, *Dialog. de*

Trin. i. 164, cites this passage as from "*The Catholic Epistles.*"—M.] Peter, who often uses the word glory, connects it elsewhere with κρατός, 1 Pet. iv. 11; v. 11, here with ἀρετή. So Paul also praises the glory of the grace of God, Eph. i. 6; cf. Acts vii. 2; Rom. i. 23; ii. 7; v. 2; ix. 4; xv. 7; 1 Cor. ii. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 18; viii. 23; Phil. i. 11; Col. i. 11. On *glory* see the note on 1 Pet. i. 7. δι' ὧν shows that δόξα and ἀρετή must not be reduced to one idea and rendered "glorious power." Respect being had to the above mentioned connection, and to the derivation of ἀρετή (from ἀνήρ or ἄρης, like *virtus* from *vir*), which denotes primarily manhood, strength, valour, we cannot, with Bengel, refer ἀρετή to the moral attributes of God, but rather adopt the exposition of Roos, that "God calls us by means of a glorious, great, rich and wonderful grace, which is worthy of His Divine Name, and by a mighty energy, because His call is powerful and also a drawing, which renders our coming to Christ possible, Jno. vi. 44; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9."—δόξα; connect with the brightness with which God shines in the hearts of those whom He wakens, 2 Cor. iv. 6. Others refer δόξα and ἀρετή to the manifestation of the glory and moral perfection of God in the Person of Christ. Jno. i. 14; Acts ii. 22; x. 38. Huther refers δόξα to His Being, ἀρετή to His acts.

VER. 4. **Through which He hath given unto us the greatest and (*most*) precious promises.**—Through which, *i. e.*, His glory and Divine power.—ἐπαγγέλματα properly, promises, which, although they are gifts *per se*, are the more precious because their bestowal involves also the bestowal of part of the promised riches. Thus we read in Acts ii. 33, "having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost," *i. e.*, the Holy Ghost who had been promised. Hence Gerhard understands it of the promised riches themselves, *i. e.*, redemption and atonement, adoption, union with God, the gift of righteousness and eternal life. Only it should be remembered that these are likewise the earnest of still greater riches to come.—δεδώρηται, again Middle, to be joined with καλέσας.

That by means of these ye might become partakers of the Divine nature.—It is incorrect to construe with Roos and *al.*: "The sum-total of what is contained in the great and precious promises of God, is that we may become partakers of the Divine nature." ἵνα rather intimates that the reference is to the end contemplated in those glorious attributes and promises of God.—διὰ τούτων refers both to δόξα and ἀρετή and to ἐπαγγέλματα. [But it is doubtful whether there is such a double reference; τούτων seems to point to ἐπαγγέλματα as the nearest noun. See Winer, p. 170. ἵνα is telic, and the end proposed in these promises is their becoming partakers of the Divine nature.—M.]

Partakers of the Divine nature; φύσις, the Being, the Essence proper, cf. Rom. xi. 24; Eph. ii. 3; Jas. iii. 7, from φύω, as it is with God from all eternity, and comprises all His perfections. "What is the Divine nature?" asks Luther. "Eternal truth, righteousness, eternal life, peace, joy, delight, and whatsoever good may be named. Hence he, who becomes a partaker of the Divine nature, is wise, righteous and omnipotent against the devil, sin and death." Calvin aptly compares the incarnation of Christ. As His human nature partook of the Divine, so believers are to become partakers of the Divine nature.—The reference, consequently, is not only to a moral resemblance, to an ideal communion, but to a veritable communion of being, which begins here below in our regeneration, 1 Jno. i. 3, but will be consummated hereafter. Cf. Rom. viii. 29; Jno. xvii. 21. This involves the glorification of the body, Phil. iii. 21, seeing God and sharing in His glory, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, and increasing resemblance to Him, 1 Jno. iii. 2. "When He shall appear we shall *resemble* (ὅμοιοι) Him." "This does not mean that the partakers of the Divine nature shall be exactly like (*i. e.*, equal to) God. God reserves to Himself His Person, although He shares with us His nature. As the sun reflects his image in a clear lake or a dew-drop and yet remains the sun, so also does God remain as He was and as He is, although He has made men partakers of His nature." Zeller's *Biblisches Wörterbuch.* [Origen, in *Levit. Hom.* 4, cites this passage as from a genuine writing of Peter, also Athanasius, *c. Arian. Orat.* 2. 1. 133. Wordsw. —M.]

Having escaped from the corruption, etc.—ἀποφυγόντες, not in a preceptive sense, as Calov takes it, "only ye shall escape," for it is immediately connected with the preceding clause and not with the following Imperative: it rather means after, on the supposition that, ye have escaped. The Aorist, which denotes an action merely as a past event (Winer, pp. 290. 291) forbids the rendering, "if ye escape forthwith." Bengel: "There is an antithesis between *partakers* and *escaping*, and also between *Divine nature* and *corruption in lust*. This escaping denotes not so much our duty as a Divine benefit which accompanies the communion with God."

τὴν φθοράν (cf. Rom. viii. 21; Gal. vi. 8; Col. ii. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 12. 19) not Active, but Passive, not only moral, but physical corruption. Here we meet again the antithesis between the perishable and the imperishable which is deeply rooted in the Apostle's soul. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 4. 7. 18. 23–25; 2 Pet. iii. 10, etc.—Corruption reigns in the world and penetrates it in all its parts; its source and strength lie in the anti-divine lust which excites the wrath of God and ruins human nature, in soul and body. Cf. Eph. iv. 22. Roos: "There lies a corruption in the lusts common to the world. The old man through lusts corrupts himself in error, so that he grows worse and worse. The carnal lusts war against the soul, which thereby is increasingly enfeebled and darkened. It grows in wickedness, becomes more like the devil, and inclines to hell. Through many of these lusts the naturally good condition of the body also is ruined." [Calvin: "*Hanc non in elementis quae nos circumstant, sed in corde nostro esse ostendit, quia illic regnant vitiosi et pravi affectus, quorum fontem vel radicem voce concupiscentiae notat. Ergo ita locatur in munda corruptio, ut scimus in nobis esse mundum.*"—M.]

VER. 5. **But for this very reason—knowledge.**—καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ begins the apodosis. αὐτὸ τοῦτο used adverbially, *it is just therefore—wherefore I exhort you, it is for this very reason, on this very account*, see Winer, p. 155.—καὶ as God

does His part, so do ye yours. δὲ is added, because the positive side of their escape is now made prominent. [τοῦτο δὲ σπ. παρεισενέγκαντες stands parallel to ὡς πάντα . . δεδωρημένης, etc., and v. 4 is an explanatory relative clause to the words διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, so Winer.—M.]

All diligence.—Cf. vv. 10. 15; iii. 14. A very comprehensive term. Use with all earnestness the energies of faith which have been bestowed upon you for your holiness.—Luther:—"Ye have a goodly heritage and a good field, take care that you suffer no thistles and weeds to grow in it."—παρεισενέγκαντες (ἅπαξ λεγ.) denotes bringing in something along with one, quietly and without ostentatious display.—ἐπιχορηγεῖν, a word peculiar to Paul, 2 Cor. ix. 10; Gal. iii. 5; Col. ii. 19, to furnish, supply. Generally the reference to the chorus is entirely ignored. The word is often used of expenses that are incurred, and denotes here that we must be prepared to incur expenses in order to furnish this garland of virtues. The furnishing on our part corresponds to the furnishing on God's part, v. 10. "The gifts of God are followed by our diligence, our diligence is followed by the entrance into the kingdom." Dietlein gives the ungrammatical rendering: "leads in the dance."—ἐν τῇ πίστει. Faith, which leads the chorus, identical with the practical knowledge of vv. 2. 3, is the root of those virtues, love, its crown, ends it. Augustine: "Faith is the root and mother of all virtues." It appears here as a gift of grace, Jno. vi. 29; Eph. ii. 8. 9.—ἀρετήν, manly, decided conduct before the three enemies of our salvation, and readiness to good works. It corresponds to the ἀρετὴ of God, v. 4, which energetically repels all evil. De Wette and Huther are too general in rendering "moral fitness." Of the seven fruits on the tree of faith this is the first and the best, cf. Phil. iv. 8. It must be coupled with γνῶσις, which is different from ἐπίγνωσις, of which it is the fruit, cf. 1 Pet. iii. 7; Phil. i. 9; a wise demeanour with a ready perception of what is useful or harmful, of what is to be done and to be avoided, cf. Eccl. viii. 9. It preserves us from indiscreet zeal and exaggerations. Luther:—"Prudence is the eye of all virtues, without which virtue easily degenerates into faults." Calov:—"It leads and moderates all virtues, so that in the practice of it we err neither by doing too much nor too little, nor stray from the right goal."

Vv. 6. 7. **And in knowledge—love.**—ἐγκράτεια, abstinence from the lust of the world, self-control. "It abstains from the evil it knows to identify, and in Christian liberty steadily bridles the desires, 1 Pet. iv. 8; Gal. v. 22." Richter. ὑπομονή, endurance, perseverance under abuse, want, troubles, dangers and sufferings. "Self-government accustoms men to be hard to themselves, and thus to endure sufferings." Ph. M. Hahn.—τὴν εὐσέβειαν, the disposition in which the consideration of God controls the whole life, in which He is held in supreme honour, whereby His approval is sought, and the doing of which things constitutes its own happiness.—φιλαδελφία, 1 Pet. i. 22; Rom. xii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 1; Gal. vi. 10.—τὴν ἀγάπην, love in general, universal kindness toward all men. Bengel:—"Each of these several steps begets and facilitates the next; each next tempers and perfects the preceding."—Gerlach:—"The import of this scale of Christian graces may be still more appreciated by considering it in an inverted order, and by acquiring the conviction that each successive step necessarily presupposes the one which precedes it."

Ver. 8. **For if these things are in you,** etc.—ὑπάρχειν, to lie under, to be taken for granted, to be truly subsisting, to be at one's command, like a property. If these qualities have become your inward property, cf. Acts iii. 6.—πλεονάζοντα, and if by daily practice they multiply, Rom. v. 20; vi. 1; 2 Thess. i. 3, they will not suffer you to appear as unworkful [ἀργός =ἄεργος.—M.] and unfruitful; they will exhibit themselves in all manner of good works, and impel you to an ever-growing, profound, comprehensive and thorough knowledge of Jesus Christ. Thus there is an admirable fitness, in that the knowledge of Christ, which consists of different gradations, is first described as the source and afterwards as the fruit of those virtues. [Christ is the Author and Finisher of our faith.—M.]

Ver. 9. **For he to whom these things—not seeing afar off.**—Supply before γάρ the thought, 'strive so much the more earnestly after these things, for—otherwise you go in the direction of relapse and blindness.' Huther:—"A negative illustrative explanation of the preceding verse. He is blind while he thinks after the manner of those false teachers, that he has light; he knows neither himself, nor God, nor Christ; he is in the darkness, 1 Jno. ii. 9. 11; Rev. iii. 17; Prov iv. 19."—μυωπάζων from μύωψ, one who is near-sighted and obliged partly to shut his eyes in order to see objects at a distance. Such an one accordingly is blind both in regard of the present and of the future; he intentionally shuts the eyes of his spirit against the light, wherever it is disagreeable to him. Grotius, falsely:—"He is blind, or if not wholly blind, short-sighted." Huther:—"He only sees that which is near (earthly things), not that which is distant (heavenly things)." [Fronmüller's view is the reproduction of that of Suidas: "*Itaque* τυφλὸς μυωπάζων' *is dicitur qui ideo cæcus est, quia sponte claudit oculos, ut ne videat, aut qui videre se dissimulat, quod vel invitus cernit.*"—M.]

Having placed in forgetfulness the purification of his former sins.—This describes the way in which that getting blind is brought about. Bengel notes the fitness of the term λήθην λαβὼν as expressive of that which man willingly suffers, that which he wishes for, cf. Rom. v. 19. An example is found in the wicked servant, Matt. xviii. 28.—τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν.—Winer inclines to the interpretation, "purification of sins=putting away of sins, removal of sins," p. 200. But one can hardly say: καθαρίζονται ἁμαρτίαι. Sins are purified=removed. Translate, rather, "the purification of their sins, *i. e.*, of their guilt, which takes place in justification," cf. Ps. li. 4; Ex. xxix. 36. 37; Heb. i. 3; ix. 22. 23; 1 Jno. i. 7. It emanates from the blood of Christ by means of faith, Rom. iii. 24. 25. [Oecumenius:—"καὶ γὰρ καὶ οὗτος ἐπιγνοὺς ἑαυτὸν διὰ τὸ καθαρθῆναι τῷ ἁγίῳ βαπτίσματι, ὅτι πλήθους ἁμαρτιῶν ἐξεπλύθη, δέον εἰδέναι ὅτι καθαρθεὶς καὶ ἁγιότητα ἔλαβε, νήφειν

ἵνα διαπαντὸς τηρῇ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὐ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον, ὁ δὲ ἐπελάθετο."—M.]

Ver. 10. **Wherefore the rather**, etc.—σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν.—Lachmann's reading (see Appar. Crit.) is only in apparent conflict with Paul, who also insists upon a faith evidenced by love and good works. "Peter desires that our calling and election should be also secure with us and not only with God, and that we should make it thus secure by good works." Luther.—Our calling becomes secure, sure and certain, if it leads to the issue which is desired.—**Brethren.**—This address is not found in the first Epistle; but we have its equivalent: *Beloved*, ch. ii. 11. [Bengel: *In priore epistola nunquam, in altera semel hanc appellationem Petrus adhibet: ex quo gravitas hujus loci apparet.*—M.]

Your calling and election sure.—The calling is placed first with reference to ourselves, who become first conscious of our calling, and afterwards of our election. ἐκλογή denotes not the worthiness and distinction conditioned by our our own doings, nor our entering here in *time* into communion with God, but as usual, the eternal purpose of God, cf. 1 Pet. i. 1; ii. 4. 6. 9; Acts ix. 15; Rom. ix. 11; xi. 5. 7. 28; 1 Thess. i. 4. Those who consider themselves elect are still liable to stumble and fall. Huther applies it to the separation of the called from the world and to their translation into the kingdom of God, in which their calling is instrumental.—Augustine: —"Even for perseverance in obedience you must hope in the Father of Light, and implore Him in daily prayers; but in doing so you must have the assurance that you are not excluded from the election of His people, because it is God Himself who enables you to do so."

For if ye do these things, if ye exhibit these qualities (v. 5, etc.), **ye shall never stumble.**—οὐ μὴ πταίσητε.—πταίειν, to strike the foot against a stone, to stumble, to fail, to come to grief. The figure is taken here, as in 1 Cor. ix. 24, from those who, at the games, run within the course. Tossan:—"James (iii. 2) says, indeed, that we all fail or stumble in various ways; but Peter here refers to a stumbling which denotes a man's keeping down, or his falling wholly away from the grace of God, or forfeiting it," cf. Heb. xii. 13.—The Intensive οὐ μή with the *Conj. Aor.* is used when something is to happen at an indefinite period, or very rapidly, see Winer, p. 528.

For thus shall be richly furnished to you, etc.—*Richly* corresponds to πλεονάζειν, v. 8, and is the antithesis to 1 Pet. iv. 18, "that ye may enter not as from shipwreck or a fire, but as it were in triumph." Bengel.—"But those who enter otherwise (although we ought not to despair of the weak) will not pass on thus joyously, the door will not be open as wide for them, but it will be narrow and hard to them, so that they struggle and would rather be weak all their life than die once." Luther.—Huther understands the rich fulness of future felicity.—ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται corresponds to v. 5. If ye richly contribute, furnish forth those virtues, God also will furnish you a richly opened entrance into His kingdom. Roos thinks that this entrance begins already here upon earth. "The state of grace builded upon the foundation of the calling and election of God becomes more and more immovable, so that the danger of losing it is continually lessening. One enters also further and further into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, so that one receives more and more richly the Spirit who rules all things therein, and through this Spirit one obtains more and more fully the knowledge of the Father and the Son and the capacity of acting in all cases more and more in conformity to the laws which are valid in that kingdom."—βασιλείαν is connected with the synoptical sayings of Christ, and is not found in the first Epistle, which describes eternal life by the figure of an inheritance, 1 Pet. i. 4; iii. 9, 7.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is impossible to enter into the stream of truth, power and Apostolical majesty which we encounter at the opening of this Epistle without gaining the firm conviction that here speaks not an unknown personage of the second century, who falsely arrogates to himself the title of an Apostle and the name of the Prince of the Apostles, but that it is he himself, as he testifies in the Introduction to the Epistle.

2. As in Paul, so here, the atonement whereby the justice of God was satisfied, and justification by faith in the free grace of God in Christ, are represented as the centre of the Christian faith.

3. An essential moment of faith is knowledge, to which peculiar prominence is given in the second Epistle of Peter, doubtless, among other reasons, because the Apostle had to deal with an intellectual tendency which attached a very great value to knowledge, although it was only onesided and theoretical. He, therefore, vindicates the claims of vital, practical knowledge, ch. i. 2. 3. 5. 6. 8; ii. 20; iii. 18; the beginning, progress and completion of which should be duly distinguished from one another, ch. i. 3. 8. "He opposes to the falsely celebrated knowledge of those false teachers the true knowledge." Besser. Cf. Rev. ii. 24; 1 Jno. ii. 23; Jno. xvii. 3.

4. The wakening of a sinner from spiritual death and the communication of a new life to him require on the part of God the same putting forth of power as the resurrection of Christ from the dead, Eph. i. 19. 20. Hence every thing is here referred back to the Divine Power. "In conversion, justification, and the first bestowal of grace, grace alone works for and in us sinners. But afterwards we are bound and able to coöperate, not in our own strength, but in the strength of God by grace." Richter. Our confessions teach rightly: "That as those who are physically dead cannot of themselves and of their own strength reanimate their dead bodies and restore them to life, so also those who are dead in sins cannot of their own strength achieve their spiritual and heavenly righteousness and spiritual life, unless the Son of God deliver them from the death of sins and quicken them," 2 Cor. iii. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 14; Jno. xv. 5; Phil. ii. 13; *Formula Concordiæ*. Müller, p. 590.—*Confess. Aug.*, Art. 2, 18.

5. How lofty the vocation of us poor, sinful men! The kingdom of God, communion with

God, His glory and actually participation in His Nature are all held out to us. While pantheism dreams of a God, who as the universal Spirit of the world is ever engaged in an incessant alternation of ebb and flow, now distributing and again gathering Himself, now scattering in innumerable drops and again flowing back into an ocean, Holy Scripture makes us acquainted with the living, personal God, eternally exalted above His creatures, and yet so condescending to those who love Him as to make them partakers of His Being. The Triune God wills to dwell in His elect, to make them one spirit with Him, and yet to make them personally different from Him.

6. "Corruptible and perishable lust often commends itself as a thing permitted, and wicked men often turn and twist the commandments of God until they think that they have found a warrant for the gratification of that lust; because then this perverted dogma of Christian liberty constitutes the whole of their Gospel, which they are minded and ready to practise." Roos.

7. Doubts of one's calling and election to eternal life are best overcome by giving all diligence in furnishing those virtues (v. 5), and warring against the opposite sins. "Although all the rest (v. 5, etc.,) flows from faith in the grace of God in Christ, it attains only gradually the control of man's doing and not-doing through proof." Gerlach. "On the seven-fold tree of faith one part grows out of the other; the first contains the germ of the second, the second enables the third to come to a healthy growth, and all of them together are consummated in love." Besser.—Good works are indissolubly united to the true knowledge of Jesus Christ, so that knowledge also must be denied to the idle and unfruitful.

8. Those who forget the principal article of the forgiveness of sins through the blood of Jesus, lack the most efficient incentive to holiness, the Spirit, who teaches men to abhor sin as the greatest evil, takes flight, and relapse inevitably ensues.

9. The election of believers is forever objectively secure; but they must become more and more firmly established in it, so that nothing shall be able to upset their being sealed with the Holy Spirit.

10. "The seven-fold furnishing forth of virtue on the part of believers will encounter in the eternal kingdom of Jesus Christ, the riches of which are unfathomable, a seventy times seven-fold furnishing forth of glory. As on the arrival of a welcome guest with numerous attendants, we throw open the folding door of the house, so likewise a rich entrance into the hall of heaven awaits those who arrive there with the retinue of honest works of faith, Rev. xiv. 13." Besser.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The highly-important knowledge that Jesus is my Lord.—The fountain of all godliness flows in the living knowledge of Christ —Participation in the Divine Nature the highest aim of Christianity.—Ver. 7. Glorious fruits on the tree of faith.—The gifts of God and the fidelity of man must go hand in hand.—The cycle-life of Christianity which begins and ends with the knowledge of Jesus.—The straight way to the heavenly Zion.—The great blindness of those who forget the purification from their former sins.

Starke:—The Apostles have no privileges over other believers, either in salvation or the appointment of it, but they are all alike loved by God in Christ, and regarded, as it were, as one, Rom. iii. 29, 30; Gal. iii. 28; Eph. iv. 5.—The omnipotence and might of God is as evident in the kingdom of grace as in the work of creation and the kingdom of nature. The same power wakens, enlightens, quickens, cleanses, sanctifies, strengthens, confirms, and keeps the sinner unto salvation.—Nobody can be right in complaining of his inability to do good; is it not given to him of God? Piety is not impossible in the power of God. Use it with all diligence and earnestness, Phil. iv. 13.—To receive in faith according to the Gospel, and to give in love according to the law, must ever go together in the Christian life, so that receiving may truly promote giving, and the giving truly evidence the receiving.—False conceit, to hanker after sinful desires, and yet to imagine that one is the child of God! The two cannot exist together. If you desire the latter, you must let go the former, Eph. v. 1.—The regenerate must faithfully use all the powers of grace they have received, and be very diligent in good works, and thereby prove their new birth, Titus ii. 14.—The golden chain of virtue is man's most becoming ornament; let no one sever its links; who wants one, shall have them all, Jas. ii. 10.—Although godliness begins at once with faith, it does not truly evidence itself in its proofs until it endures; then it is not confined to good motions and resolutions, but the practice of good becomes a continual and blessed habit, Titus iii. 14.—How very different is genuine Christian love from merely natural love! Who knows this truly but those who are born of God?—The more a believer grows in holiness, the more vanish the obstacles to true enlightenment, and the clearer grows his knowledge of spiritual and heavenly things, Rom. xii. 2.—Those who have received gifts from God and do not use them faithfully, are worse off than if they had received nothing at all, for they only increase their condemnation, Luke xii. 47, 48.—Godliness does not merit eternal life, but it belongs to the order of salvation.—Shameful deceit, if thou leadest a godless life, and yet fanciest to be saved at last. Art thou sure that thou wilt be converted on thy dying bed? Depend not on the case of the dying thief; it may happen to one, but the most are lost, Sir. xviii. 22.—To live a truly godly life belongs to a happy, as well as to a joyful death. For although a joyful readiness to die is purely of God's grace, it can only happen to those who, because of an unblemishable life, have a good conscience, Prov. xiv. 32.

Lisco:—The heavenly possessions of the Christian.—The communion of faith of Christians: 1. Its foundation; 2. Its effect.—The most precious jewel of the members of the Kingdom.—The final aim of the members of the Kingdom.

Bek:—Of true enlightenment.—How faith evolves a whole garland of virtues.

Gerok:—The Divine garden of a Christian heart; 1. With its heavenly nurture; 2. Noble plants; 3. Its glorious prospects.

W. Hofacker:—The most necessary and important prayers.

Scheffer:—Man glorified into a Christian.

H. Rieger:—If God sends rain and fruitful seasons from heaven, the husbandman also does not fail in diligence, and thus the expected harvest is attained. So, likewise, if God accords to us in various ways His Divine power, and man gives all diligence, that which is proposed in the heavenly calling is also attained.—The diligence we use, impels us more and more to the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, to make a good use of all the treasures it contains on all occasions, and to overcome thereby remaining obstacles.—There is no want of occasions to stumble. Unless the heart increasingly enters into purity, and the eye into simplicity, we shall stop here and there to our hurt, take a wrong view of things, make not the proper use of the power contained in our heavenly calling against those things, and this occasions stumbling, inward uncertainty, entanglements in lust and complaisance, outward stumbling and laying hold of something which weakens the hope of our calling.

[Ver. 1. The Divinity of Christ the beginning and end of this Epistle, cf. ch. iii. 18.

Verses 5–8. Three figures suggested by the Apostle's language:

1. The chain or garland of Christian virtues.

2. Faith, the *foundation* of the Christian life, has been laid by God; on that foundation let Christians rear the superstructure, taking care that each succeeding virtue rests firmly in and on the one preceding it.

3. The tree of the Christian life bearing sevenfold fruit, of which the last kind, charity, is the most precious and perfect.—M.]

[Ver. 9. Ungodliness the cause of spiritual blindness; godliness opens and perfects spiritual vision. (See Wordsworth).

Ver. 11. "According to our *different degrees* of improvement of the *grace* of God here, will be our *different degrees* of participation in His everlasting *glory* hereafter."—Bp. Bull.

The Christian's *triumphal* entry into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The things, not seen, are eternal. Life there is everlasting, Luke x. 25; the *inheritance* is everlasting, Heb. ix. 15; the *house* and the *tabernacles* are everlasting, 2 Cor. v. 1; Luke xvi. 9; the *glory* is everlasting, 2 Tim. ii. 10; *salvation* is everlasting, Heb. v. 2; and so is the kingdom of the King eternal, 1 Tim. i. 17.—M.]

[Sermons on this Section:

Ver. 1. Simeon, C.: *Every thing needful provided for us.* Works, XX., 286.

Verses 5–7. Beveridge: *The Chain of Christian graces.* Works, VI., 274.

Lenfant: *Les engagements de la foi.* Sermons, I.

Warburton: *The edification of Gospel righteousness. Confirmation.* Works, IX., 163.

Ver. 7. Zollikoffer: *Whether or not Christianity be favourable to patriotism?* Sermons on the Evils of the World, II., 243.

Ver. 10. Bp. Hall: *Good security; or, the Christian's assurance of heaven.* Works, V., 570.

Ver. 11. Bp. Bull: *The different degrees of bliss in heaven answer to the different degrees of grace here.* Works, I., 168.

Jay, W.: *Happiness in death.* Works, IX., 411.—M.]

CHAPTER I. 12–21.

Analysis:—The Apostle enforces his exhortation to holiness by the consideration of the expected nearness of his departure, confirming the certainty of the doctrine in which his readers had been instructed, *a*, by the eye-witness of himself and all the Apostles; *b*, by the word of prophecy.

12 Wherefore I will not be negligent[1] to put you always in remembrance of these
13 things, though[2] ye know *them*,[3] and be established in the present truth. Yea, I think
it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting *you* in remem-
14 brance;[4] Knowing that shortly[5] I must put off *this* my tabernacle, even as our Lord
15 Jesus Christ hath showed me. Moreover I will endeavour[6] that ye may be able after
16 my decease to have these things always in remembrance. For we have not followed
cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming[7] of our
17 Lord Jesus Christ, but were[8] eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God[9]
the Father honour and glory, when there came[10] such a voice to him from the excel-
18 lent[11] glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice
19 which came from heaven[12] we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. We
have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as
unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day[13] dawn, and the daystar arise
20 in your hearts: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private
21 interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy[14]
men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.

Verse 12. [1 διὸ μελλήσω ἀεὶ περ. τούτ. ὑπομ. ὑμᾶς Cod. Sin. ὑμᾶς before ἀεὶ Rec. A. διὸ μελλ. ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομ. περ. τούτ. B. C. Lachmann, Tisch., Alf., al.—M.]

[Lachmann reads μελλήσω, therefore I shall always be about to, always be ready to remind you; so Tischendorf. The sense is the same.—M.]

[2 καίπερ εἰδ— διεγείρ ὑμ. omitted in Cod. Sin.; but the omission is doubtful.—M.]

[3 German "it."—M.]

[German: . . . . always to remind you of these things, although ye know it, and are established in the truth which is present in you.

Translate: . . . . present with you.—M.]

Verse 13. [4 ἐν τῇ ὑπομνήσει A. Cod. Sin.—M.]

[German: But I think it right. . . . . to stir you up in such reminding.—M.]

Verse 14. [5 German "*ploetzlich kommt*," "comes suddenly."—M.]

[Knowing that the putting off of my tabernacle comes suddenly, ...

Translate: . . . . tabernacle is swift. . . . .—M.]

Verse 15. [6 σπουδάζω, Cod. Sin.; minusc.—M.]

[German: . . . . that after my departure ye may always be able to have these things in remembrance. . .

Translate: . . . . to call these things to mind.—M.]

Verse 16. [7 παρουσίαν, German "Erscheinung," appearing.—M.]

[8 So German; literally with Passive force "having been made or *admitted* eye-witnesses. The last preferable on account of the faint allusion to initiated admittance to the Eleusinian mysteries." See Exegetical and Critical.—M.]

[Translate: "For we had not . . . . when we made known . . . . but had been. . . Lillie. On the use of the Aorist for the Pluperfect see Buttmann, § 137. 3. 6; Winer, § 41. 5.—M.]

Verse 17. [9 παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ Cod. Sin. C. minusc.—M.]

[10 So German; more correctly Peile and Alford, "When a voice was borne to Him of such a kind," viz., as is stated in what follows.—M.]

[11 ὑπὸ τῆς μεγ. δόξης. "*by* the sublime glory."—M.]

Verse 18. [12 ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. Cod. Sin. A.—M.]

[German: And this voice we heard coming from heaven, when : . . .

Translate: And this voice we heard borne from heaven, when. . . . .—M.]

Verse 19. [13 ἡ ἡμέρα Cod. Sin. minusc.—M.]

[German: And we have the prophetic word as a more sure one . . . . until the day shall have dawned, and the morning star shall have arisen in your hearts.

Translate: And we have the prophetic word more sure. . . . . as unto a lamp. . . . . until the day dawn, etc.—M.]

Verse 20. [German: Knowing this first of all, that all prophecy of the Scripture is not matter of its own interpretation.—M.]

Verse 21. [14 Rec. οἱ ἅγιοι; ἅγιοι τοῦ A. Cod. Sin. (ἀπὸ Θεοῦ without οἱ ἅγιοι) B. Tisch., Alf.—M.]

[German: For no prophecy was at any time brought forth out of the will of man, but holy men of God spake, being borne along by the Holy Ghost.

Translate: For prophecy was never brought by the will of man, but men spake from God, borne along by the Holy Ghost.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 12. **Wherefore.**—The connection is as follows: In order that this glorious consummation [of participation in the blessings and glories of Christ's Kingdom, Alf.—M.] may be yours, I will not fail to exhort you to the zealous cultivation of holiness, more particularly, because my departure is close at hand. Here we have the tendency of the whole Epistle. The Apostle's aim is neither dogmatical instruction nor the refutation of false teachers, but the strengthening and encouragement in the practice of good, the growth of a virtuous disposition and of a virtuous life on the part of those to whom he writes. He mentions first the vital knowledge of God and Christ as the chief means to that desirable end.

I will not be negligent, etc.—*οὐκ ἀμελήσω.* [See Appar. Crit.—M.] His anxious care for their encouragement and confirmation is made more intense by *ἀεί.* Bengel:—"I will always think of the one thing, that it is my duty to stir you up (admonish you)."—This was doubly necessary, because of the danger of their being seduced by false prophets, ch. ii. 1. 2. Luther:—"The Christian ministry is of two kinds, as says St. Paul in Rom. xii. 7. 8. Teaching is laying the foundation of faith, and preaching it to those who are ignorant of it. Exhorting, or, as St. Peter says, reminding, is preaching to those who know and have heard (the Gospel), admonishing and stirring them up to recollect what they know, to continue and increase therein."—*ὑπομιμνήσκειν*, cf. Jno. xiv. 26; 2 Tim. ii. 14; Tit. iii. 1; 3 Jno. 10; Jude 5. Paul uses the term *ἐπαναμιμνήσκειν*, Rom. xv. 15

Although ye know them and have been established.—*εἰδότας* sc. *ταῦτα.*—*ἐστηριγμένους*; *στηρίζω*, to set fast, establish. The truth was preached to you, 1 Pet. i. 12, confirmed by me, ch. v. 12, and you are fully convinced of it.—*ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ*, the truth has been brought near to you, yea it is present in your hearts. Similarly, Paul in Rom. x. 8. 6, "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart." [Calvin: "*Vos quidem, inquit, probe tenetis quænam sit evangeliæ veritas, neque vos quasi fluctuantes confirmo, sed in re tanta monitiones nunquam sunt supervacuæ, quare nunquam molestaie esse debent. Simili excusatione utitur Paulus ad Rom.* xv. 14."—M.]

VER. 13. **But I deem it right—reminding.**—*δὲ* is often used by way of explanation. *γάρ* might have been used, but on account of the preceding *εἰδότας* and *ἐστηριγμένους* we have an adversative conjunction. Winer, p. 474, 475.—*σκήνωμα* like *σκηνή*, *σκῆνος*, tent, tabernacle. Thus the Doric poets and Pythagorean philosophers call the body the *σκῆνος* of the soul. Plato calls *σῶμα* the *σῆμα* of the soul, its prison, or grave. Paul makes use of the phrase, "earthly house of tabernacle," 2 Cor. v. 1, with reference to the metaphor in Is. xxxviii. 12 and Wisd. ix. 15. Bengel:—"It denotes the immortality of the soul, the brevity of its stay in this mortal body, and the facility of its departure in faith." We may add that it also describes Christians as strangers and warriors, who use tents or huts instead of houses.—*διεγείρειν.* Intensive form of *ἐγείρειν*, thoroughly to arouse from sleep and sleepiness through every impediment.

VER. 14. **Knowing that—hath declared me.**—Our Lord had announced to St. Peter the manner of his death, death upon the cross when

he should have grown old, Jno. xxi. 18. 19. Old age had now set in, but he seems to have received another particular revelation respecting the nearness and suddenness of his death; this may also have been the case with St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 6. Grotius observes that similar revelations were made to Cyprian and Chrysostom.—ταχινή, suddenly and quickly, ἐν τάχει, as in Luke xviii. 8; Rev. i. 1. [Vulgate:—"*Certus quod velox est depositio tabernaculi mei.*" Bengel:—"*Repentina est. Præsens, qui diu ægrotant, possunt alios adhuc pascere. Crux id Petro non erat permissura. Ideo prius agit, quod agendum est.*"—M.]—ἀπόθεσις seems to apply to the figure of a garment, but suits also that of a tent, because this is laid aside after having served its purpose. In the following verse, the Apostle calls death an exodus (a going out), just as our Lord spoke of it as a going to the Father, Jno. xiv. 2, etc. A proof of the calmness with which the Master and the disciple contemplated the violent and painful death of the cross. [ἔξοδος in connection with σκήνωμα seems to be associated with the history of the Transfiguration, cf. Lke. ix. 31. 33, and contain incidental internal evidence of the genuineness of the Epistle, as such an association would hardly have occurred to any but an eye-witness of that memorable event.—M.]

Ver. 15. **Moreover, I will endeavour**, etc.—σπουδάσω for the usual σπουδάσομαι, see Winer, p. 101. I will take pains, that ye may have, etc., similar to the Latin *studeo* with *Infin.*—ἑκάστοτε, every time, on every occasion of necessity or emergency. — ἔχειν μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι ἔχω with *Infin.*, as in the Classics, to be able to exercise the memory. As to the subject matter, it may relate to the present Epistle; but the conjecture of Richter "that the Apostle here holds out to them the hope of a fixed, written Gospel, the Gospel according to Mark being considered Peter's Gospel," may not be improbable. Cf. Lange on Mark, p. 6, etc. On this supposition only the true import of this verse is realized, for otherwise it would seem to be rather pleonastic. So Michaelis, Pott, and al. De Wette thinks that Peter here holds out the promise of other Epistles, but v. 14 renders this conjecture improbable.—μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι.—Romish interpreters discover here falsely an intimation of Peter's intercession in heaven, but such an interpretation is even grammatically impossible. [This is not all; the Papists not only twist this passage into the intercession of saints, but use it in support of their doctrine of the invocation of saints. As a sample of such perversion of Holy Writ take the interpretation of Corn.-a Lap.: "ἔχειν, *habere scilicet in mente et memoria mea ut crebro vestri sim memor apud Deum, cumque pro vobis orem, ut horum monitorum meorum memoriam vobis refricet. . . Hinc patet S. Petrum et Sanctos vita functos curare res mortalium, ideoque esse invocandos.*" See the judicious note of Alford.—M.]

Ver. 16. **For we did not follow cunningly-devised fables**, etc.—μῦθοι, myths, legends, fictions, according to the exposition of the ancients: lying stories dressed up in the garb of truth. [Pott:—"*fabulæ ad decipiendos hominum animos artificiose excogitatæ atque exornatæ.*"—M.]—σοφίζω=to devise cunningly, invent artificially. Oecumenius mentions the fictions of the Valentinians, which belong, however, to the second century. Calov:—"They were perhaps Jewish and heathen fables, such as are found in Hesiod and Ovid, taken up by those false teachers," cf. ch. ii. 3.—ἐξακολουθήσαντες, to follow up, pursue with great care, ch. ii. 2. 15. [Bengel:—τὸ ἐξ *errorem notat. Talis error in hac re nullus.*—M.]

When we made known to you.—Where? Partly orally, partly in the first Epistle, cf. ch. i. 7. 13; ii. 4. 21; iii. 18, etc.; iv. 7. 13. The reference to St. Mark's Gospel is here out of the question. [But why any more here than in v. 15? Such a reference is far from improbable.—M.]

The power and appearing refer to the chief epochs of His life, as indicated in ch. iii. 18, etc. Not by *hendiadys*=the power visible at His appearing, but two different though closely connected ideas. δύναμις embraces the riches of His whole life and salvation, the whole treasure of the Divine power centred in Him, His wonderful works, His power over the hearts of men, His power as Teacher and Redeemer, His resurrection in power after His crucifixion in weakness, 2 Cor. xiii. 4, His descent to the realms of death, His ascension and His supreme dominion.—παρουσία, the presence, appearing, coming. It is used of Christ coming to judgment, Matt. xxiv. 3. 27. 37. 39; 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13; v. 23; iv. 15; 2 Thess. ii. 1. 8; Jas. v. 7; 2 Pet. iii. 4. 12; 1 Jno. ii. 28. In this sense it might be taken here (so Gerhard, Huther, de Wette); but seeing that παρουσία is used of the present in 1 Cor. 16. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 6. 7; x. 10; Phil. i. 26; ii. 26, that the present and the future interpenetrate each other in the previous passages, that, moreover, the sequel refers to the past, it is perhaps best to adopt the exposition of Hahn, who blends the two: "His manifestation in the flesh accompanied by miraculous power, and His expected future appearing in glory." We have here also an antithesis to the economy of the Old Testament, under which salvation and the Author of salvation were only promised, but had not yet appeared in reality, 1 Pet. i. 11; 2. Pet. i. 19. Calov:—"The Epistle is directed against those who denied the power and the first advent of Christ."

But were eye-witnesses of His majesty.—ἐπόπται, sometimes used of those who were admitted to the third and highest degree of initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries; the verb is also used in this sense. Peter, to whom the word is peculiar, 1 Pet. ii. 12; iii. 2, does not advert to its technical sense, but uses it in the sense of careful and close inspection and observation. Huther says that reference is made to the circumstance that the μεγαλειότης of Christ has a mystery concealed from the others.—μεγαλειότης=might and greatness, majesty, used of the mighty power of God, and exhibited in the miracles of Christ, Lke. ix. 43; of the admired greatness and splendour of Diana, Acts xix. 27. Similarly μεγαλωσύνη, Heb. i. 3; viii. 1.

Ver. 17. **For He received from God the Father honour and glory.**—λαβὼν γάρ. An anacoluthon, to which ἐτύγχανε may be supplied. The construction is interrupted by the parenthesis. The sentence, "He was declared to be the Father's beloved Son." Winer, 368, 369. [But this construction, although possible, is not that

recommended by Winer, who gives Fronmüller's in a note, but says in the text: "The structure is interrupted by the parenthetical clause *φωνῆς—εὐδόκησα*; and the Apostle continues in v. 18 with *καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν*, instead of saying *ἡμᾶς εἶχε ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἀκούσαντας*, or something similar." To give this in English render, "For having received from God the Father honour and glory, (when a voice was borne to Him—well pleased), and this voice ye heard, etc."—M.] The transfiguration of Jesus on the mount is produced as an example of the personal experience of the Apostle of the power and appearing of Christ, cf. Acts x. 39; v. 32, where Peter also refers to his having been an eye-witness.—*τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν*, see 1 Pet. i. 7; Rom. ii. 7. 10. The former may apply to His mission, the latter to His person. [Or perhaps, better, and less far fetched, *τιμήν* may refer to the voice which spoke to Him, and *δόξαν* to the light that shone from Him; so Alford. Burgon calls attention to the remarkable resemblance of this passage and Jno. i. 14 concerning the same event, of which St. Peter and St. John were eye-witnesses.—M.]

When there came to Him such a voice —well pleased.—*ἐνεχθείσης* indicates the manner how He received honour and glory: *φέρεται φωνή*= נָפַל, Is. ix. 8; Dan. iv. 28, elsewhere *γίγνεται*, Lke. ix. 35. 36, or *ἔρχεται*, Jno. xii. 30. 28, denotes the objective, unmistakable, important character of the voice. It was not a dream or an imaginary illusion, like many fables, but it was a voice sounding from on high. The word is repeated with emphasis in the next verse. According to Matthew xvii. 5, and Mark ix. 7, it came out of a bright cloud, but Peter carries us higher up to the *μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα*, of which the cloud was only the symbol. The last words seem to be a periphrasis of God Himself (so Gerhard, de Wette, Huther and al.), such as *δύναμις* is used in Matt. xxvi. 64; cf. Ps. civ. 2; 1 Tim. vi. 16.—*Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός*; the same words occur in Matt., but with the addition: *αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε*, and *ἐν ᾧ* instead of *εἰς ὃν*; the latter occurs also at Matt. xii. 18.—*εἰς* indicates the direction of the Divine pleasure on Him from before the foundation of the world; according to Dietlein, the historical motion of the Divine plan of salvation with reference to Him. [Wordsworth:—The *originality* of the reading *εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησα* may be remarked as an argument for the *genuineness* of the Epistle. A forger would have *copied* the reading in St. Matthew, xvii. 5.—M.]

VER. 18. **And this voice we heard**, etc.—*ἡμεῖς* refers specifically to the three Apostles, Peter, James and John, while the plural number in v. 16 includes also the other Apostles. The celestial declaration was not reported to us by others, but we heard it, being with Him at the time, with our own ears.

On the holy mount.—Not on Mount Zion, as Grotius maintains, connecting it erroneously with the incident recorded in Jno. xii. 28. Calvin: "Wherever the Lord comes, He hallows (because He is the fountain of all holiness) everything by the fragrance of His presence." The mountain of transfiguration is generally identified with Mount Tabor, about two hours' distance from Nazareth, in the north-eastern part of the plain of Jezreel: but because Mount Tabor was fortified, and consequently not a solitary place, and because Jesus at that time had retired to the head-waters of the river Jordan, the mountain of transfiguration is placed by others in the neighbourhood of Hermon. See Zeller, *Biblisches Wörterbuch* II. 710. [The epithet "*holy*," applied to that mount, affords evidence that the history of the transfiguration was well known at the time when Peter wrote this Epistle. The inference of de Wette, that it indicates a belief of the *miraculous*, is neither logically correct nor creditable to his estimate of Apostolical Christianity.—M.]

VER. 19.—Here follows the second testimony for the glory of Christ and the irrefragable certainty of his doctrine, viz.: the word of prophecy. The reference here is evidently to the prophecies of the Old Testament, which are taken as a connected whole, and not to the prophecies of the New Testament, as Griesbach alleges. Ch. ii. 1, etc., settles this point, which is further confirmed by other references of Peter to O. T. prophecies, cf. 1 Pet. i. 10; Acts iii. 18; x. 43. Bengel: "The words of Moses, Isaiah and all the prophets really constitute only one word (*sermo*) exhibiting a perfect agreement in all its parts."

And we have the prophetic word as more sure.—*ἔχομεν*. "We possess," not, "We hold it surer." *βεβαιότερον*, not "fast" or "very fast," as Luther and Beza. The force of the comparative must be brought out. Gerhard: "The testimony of the prophets is declared to be more sure than that of the Apostles concerning the voice of the Father in heaven and the transfiguration of Christ. Not more sure *per se* and absolutely, but in respect of the readers of the Epistle. Among these were converts from Judaism who paid the utmost reverence to the prophetical writings and did not set so high a value on the preaching of the Apostles." Cf. Acts xvii. 11. So (substantially) Augustine, Bede and *al.* But Peter was hardly prepared to subordinate the testimony of his eyes and ears to that of the prophets. The view of de Wette is forced, "the prophetic word is more sure to us now (that we have seen and heard these things, vv. 17. 18)." Nor can we approve of Huther's exposition, that in respect of the Christian's hope the word of prophecy is more sure and certain than the testimony of the transfiguration, which presented only the glory of Christ in the days of His flesh, but did not directly confirm His future coming in glory (this is the sense in which he takes the *παρουσία*), whereas the prophetic word does point to the future coming of Christ. Oecumenius gives the right sense, saying that the truth of the promise was confirmed by its fulfilment, and that this has made the prophetic word more sure and certain now than it was before. So Grotius, Bengel, Dietlein. "We possess *now* the prophecies of the Old Testament as more sure than they were before." Gerlach: "The fulfilment of the chief burden of the prophecies, viz., the manifestation of Jesus Christ, has now confirmed them altogether more fully to us than before." [But although Fronmüller endorses the view of Oecu-

menius, Grotius, Bengel, Dietlein, as the right view, we have to object, that the Apostle has no such reference to *now* and *then;* but which is the right view? Alford seems to come nearest; he adheres to the grammatical force of the comparative, and renders "We have, *i. e.*, we possess, more sure," etc.; and explains the comparison of the word of prophecy and the incidents of the transfiguration. The Apostle calls the former more sure than the latter, because of its wider range, embracing not only a single testimony to Christ, as that Divine voice did, but τὰ εἰς χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας, 1 Pet. i. 11; as presenting a broader basis for the Christian's trust, and not only one fact, however important.—To this may be added the fact that the voice from heaven and the vision of the transfiguration were vouchsafed to the three Apostles only, but the testimony of the word of prophecy, as the concurrent testimony of many inspired persons in different ages, is vouchsafed to the whole Church and to every individual believer.—M.] Hence the increased responsibility of those who despise it.—Others refer the comparison to the myths, mentioned in v. 16, so Semler; but saying that the word of prophecy is more sure than those myths, would be saying very little indeed.

Whereunto ye do well—dark place.—ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες, to which ye do well that ye take heed. The Participle is used because they had already begun to do so (Winer, p. 46, 1). De Wette remarks that this seems to apply to Jewish Christians, but it applies still better to Gentile Christians, because it was self-evident in the case of the former.—προσέχοντες sc. νοῦν, to give attention, bend the mind, give heed to a thing, cf. Heb. ii. 1; Acts viii. 6. 10. 11; xvi. 14; 1 Tim. i. 4. ; iv. 1. 13; Tit. i. 14; Hebr. vii. 13.—ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι; λύχνος, a light, a lantern, a candle used at night. Bengel takes φαίνοντι as the *Imperfect* on account of διαυγάσῃ; but better take it as a *Present*.—αὐχμηρὸς=dry, arid, rough, dusty, dirty, dim, dark, because filth and darkness are often found together. What is meant by this dark place cannot be determined until we have ascertained the sense of the words following.

Until the day shall have dawned.—ἕως οὗ belongs to προσέχοντες, not to φαίνοντι. Many commentators understand the day of the blissful eternity. So Calvin: "This darkness I extend to the whole course of earthly life, and interpret that that day shall dawn when we shall see face to face that which we now see only through a mirror and in a riddle. Christ indeed shines on us in the Gospel as the Sun of Righteousness, yet so that our spirit, in part at least, remains shrouded in the darkness of death until we shall enter heaven from this carnal prison-house. Then shall dawn the splendour of the day, when no mists and clouds of ignorance and error shall shut out from us the clear view of the Sun." Similarly Dietlein: "The moment of Christ's coming." τόπος αὐχμηρός would accordingly denote not only the whole pre-christian era, but also the whole of this present life, the world not yet illumined by the glorious coming of Christ, and the hearts of believers, as yet not seeing, but only longing for the glory of Christ. This gives a beautiful meaning, and we may certainly call even the time of the New Testament, night, as contrasted with the future era, in which the glory of God shall light the heavenly Jerusalem and the Lamb shall be the light thereof, Rom. xxi. 23. But Gerhard rightly objects to this interpretation, that if the day referred to were the day of a blissful eternity, ἡμέρα ought to have the article, and that such a description of the day of Christ's advent to glory, or of the last judgment is against all analogy. Others interpret the verse of the contrast between the time of the Old Testament and that of the New. But it is against this view that the time of the N. T. had already dawned in a general sense, while the *Conj. Aor.* points to something future and possible. The reference, as Calvin observes, is rather to the antithesis between the state of nature and the state of grace. The day dawns in the heart, when man awakes from his dream-life, when the light of the holiness and justice of God shines into his heart, and enables him clearly to perceive his sinfulness; the morning star arises, when thereupon he is profoundly and vitally moved by the mercy of God in Christ, and faithful to the leadings of grace, gradually attains to a knowledge of Christ and the Divine mysteries, which is continually growing, expanding and developing into greater clearness and perfection, cf. Rom. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. v. 14. The readers of this Epistle are indeed spoken of as knowing and established in the truth, v. 12, but immediately before it is also said that they stand in need of constant reminding. This involves not any more a contradiction than does the language of Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians, where, at ch. i. 18, he prays that the eyes of their understanding might be enlightened, although he had said before that God had abounded toward them in all wisdom and prudence, ch. i. 8. 9. The majority of the readers of this Epistle we may consider to have stood only in the outer court of the sanctuary, at the beginning of true conversion; they believed the external evidences, held to the word of prophecy, separated themselves from the world, but had not yet attained a vital knowledge of Christ and entered into intimate communion with Him.—[This is substantially the view of Huther and Alford; see the latter, whose notes are very full on this passage.—M.]

And the morning star shall have arisen in your hearts.—φωσφόρος, light-bringing sc. ἀστήρ, the morning star. Hesych. understands by it the Sun. [This is a tradition among commentators, which has been set aside by Alford, who, instead of quoting from the commentators, quotes Hesych., who merely says: φωσφόρος, φωτοδότης, λαμπρὸς ἀστὴρ, light-bringer, light-giver, bright star.—M.], but the word is not used in this sense elsewhere, whereas Christ calls Himself the bright Morning Star, that heralds the eternal sunrise, Rev. xxii. 16. To him that overcometh he promises the Morning Star, *i. e.*, Himself and the brightness of His grace, Rev. ii. 28.—διαυγάζειν used of dawn. Huther quotes a passage from Polybius [ἅμα τῷ διαυγάζειν.—M.] ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, in the hearts touched by grace, not in the world generally. Now we perceive clearly what is meant by the dark place (αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ); it is, as Bengel explains it, our heart, which be-

fore conversion, is unclean, dry and dark. But considering that the same state of heart is everywhere in the world, the world in general may be described as an arid, desert and dark place.—ἕως οὗ with *Aor. Conj.* denotes the duration of an action, until the *possible* event has actually taken place. Winer, p. 812. But this does not imply that the use of prophecy is superfluous after the illumination has taken place, cf. Matt. i. 25; v. 18, 26. This is evident from the examples of the Apostles themselves.

VER. 20. **Knowing this first of all.**—The Apostle having exhorted them to give heed to prophecy, now further reminds them of the origin of prophecy, and that it must be interpreted in the same spirit, out of which it proceeded.—τοῦτο belongs to what follows.—πρῶτον, not as Bengel, "before I say it" [*priusquam ego dico*], but first and foremost, 1 Tim. ii. 1, being conscious, bearing in mind, Jas. i. 3; Heb. x. 34, like εἰδότες, 1 Pet. i. 18.

That all prophecy of the Scripture is not matter of its own interpretation.—It is not necessary to understand here a Hebraism, Winer, p. 185. The preceding shows that the reference is to the prophecies contained in the Old Testament. The prophecy of the Scripture is opposed to the false prophets. Ch. ii. 1.—οὐκ ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως, happens not as matter of its own interpretation. ἐπιλύειν, Mk. iv. 34, to interpret, to expound, to settle, to determine, to decide, Acts xix. 39.= פָּתַר Gen. xli. 12, xl. 8. The reference is to the origin, not to the interpretation of the prophecy, as is evident from v. 21. Even as to its origin it is not matter of its own interpreting. "The prophets, receiving the prophecies, were passive: a vision, a painting appeared before their mind, which they described to their hearers and readers as they saw it, without understanding all it signified, so that they themselves searched what or what manner of time the Spirit did signify, 1 Pet. i. 10–12."—"A prophecy only expresses that which God had communicated to the seer, and is consequently as much an object of search and deciphering to him as it is to us." Gerlach.—Ἰδίας is most simply construed with θελήματι ἀνθρώπου; that which depends on the exercise of the natural power and will of man. De Wette cites the following passage from Philo: "A prophet utters nothing of his own." Dietlein's interpretation is too full: "No prophecy occurs in the Scripture that could be regarded as already possessing its own interpretation; all prophecy has rather the significance and interpretation of history, and therefore must not be treated allegorically, but has its fulfilment in the facts of history and thence also its interpretation." Huther institutes a comparison with Joseph's interpretation of dreams, Gen. xl. 8. The words in which Joseph foretells the prisoners their fate constitute the προφητεία; this presupposes, on the part of Joseph, an ἐπίλυσις, an interpretation of those dreams; but Joseph ascribes that power to God, cf. Gen. xli. 15. 16. Better take those dreams as προφητεία, the interpretation of which was communicated to Joseph from on high. Bengel defines ἐπίλυσις as the interpretation in virtue of which the prophets were enabled to unlock to men things previously *locked* up.

[Alford shows that the reference here is to the prophets themselves, who were unable to *solve* or *interpret*. He quotes from Oecumenius; τουτέστιν ὅτι λαμβάνουσι μὲν ἀπὸ θεοῦ οἱ προφῆται τὴν προφητείαν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνοι βούλονται, 'ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ κινοῦν αὐτοὺς ἐνεργεῖ πνεῦμα. καὶ ᾔδεσαν μὲν καὶ συνίεσαν τὸν καταπεμπόμενον αὐτοῖς προφητικὸν λόγον, οὐ μέντοι καὶ τὴν ἐπίλυσιν αὐτοῦ ἐποιοῦντο. . . . . . καίπερ εἰδότες οὐ χρείαν εἶχον ἑρμηνεύειν τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἑτέροις διηκόνουν ταῦτα ἡμῖν γάρ. De Wette adds that this is said to excuse the difficulty of the interpretation of prophecy, and to remove occasion of unbelief and scoffing (ch. iii. 3). Alford agrees with Huther that the last purpose is not only not indicated in the context, but is quite out of the question; the Apostle referring to prophecy not as difficult of interpretation, but as a candle shining in a dark place, nay, as being even more firm and secure than external proofs of the same truth. Huther's view arises from the consideration that ἐπίλυσις is not the subsequent interpretation of a prophecy already given, but the intelligent apprehension of the meaning of the prophecy out of which (but not ἰδίας on the part of those by whom it is sent), the prophecy itself springs. This Alford considers much confirmed by γίνεται, which with a Genitive, as here, is not=ἐστιν, but rather seems to denote *origin*. So that the sense will be, that prophecy *springs not out of human interpretation, i. e.*, is not a prognostication made by a man knowing what he means when he utters it; but, etc. This seems also to be the view of Bengel.—M.]

VER. 21. **For no prophecy—Holy Ghost.**—Further substantiation of the foregoing position negatively and positively.—θελήματι, Dative of the cause, cf. *ad rem* John i. 13. The pleasure, the arbitrary will of man as opposed to the Spirit of God.—The sense: The production of a true prophecy does not depend upon the exercise of man's own power, as it was attempted in the case of heathen divination —ἠνέχθη answers to ἐνεχθείσης φωνῆς, verses 17. 18, and denotes not the utterance (so De Wette), but the origin.—φερόμενοι corresponds to the classical terms θεοφόρητος, θεοφορούμενος. They were impelled, borne along by the Holy Ghost, like a ship before a strong wind. Under this influence they remained passive, although they were fully conscious. Josephus says of Balaam, that he was moved by the Divine Spirit, cf. Heb. i. 1. Calov: "It relates as much to inward illumination as to outward impulse, yet not so that the prophets lost all self-control," Ps. xlv. 1.—ἐλάλησαν (see Appar. Crit.) This includes also their writings, Acts ii. 31; Jas. v. 10. Their written words were determined by the Holy Ghost not only as to their contents, but, in a certain manner, also as to their form.—ἅγιοι Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 11, particular instruments of the Holy Ghost, prophets or other holy men. This proves the security and the venerable character of the testimony of prophecy. But it is also to suggest the conclusion, that due regard being had to the matter, prophecy must not be arbitrarily interpreted, but in the sense of the Holy Ghost. Bernard says: "With the same spirit in which the Holy Scripture is written, it must be read and

understood." For the Holy Ghost is the best interpreter of His words.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The evangelical Church rests upon the double foundation of the pure, unadulterated word of God and the great truth of the sinner's justification through faith in the saving merit of Christ. "It is remarkable," says Besser, "that in the first chapter of this Epistle, written with the design of fortifying the Church against false teaching, the Apostle extols first that precious faith whereby we possess righteousness and exhibit virtue, and then the precious Scriptures, the light of the world in a dark place."

2. Mark the Apostle's anxious care to leave to believers a written testimony of the fundamental truths of the Gospel directed against the many false teachers, who even then began to stir themselves. "Peter therefore was not of opinion that oral tradition could preserve the memory of Apostolical teaching. It was for this very reason that he *wrote;* yea, he foretells, that the truth would be perverted by feigned words (ch. ii. 3); to these he opposes Holy Scripture, that is, the sure prophetic word of the Old Testament and the Apostolical eye- and ear-witness of Jesus Christ, which is written in the books of the New Testament, ch. iii. 16."—Chemnitz.

3. Ver. 16 and the following verses contain strong evidence of the genuineness of our Epistle. Stier: "The presumption that words, dogmas, testimonies like those contained in the second Epistle of Peter from beginning to end, could have originated in the mind of a *forger*, that such power and illumination, such assurance of speech could have coëxisted in the same soul alongside of a so-called pious fraud,—that this μυθολόγος, should intentionally personate in a "*second Epistle*" the Apostle exhorting, confessing and prophesying before his death, and yet have the audacity of expressly renouncing all σεσοφισμένους μύθους, and withal endowed with such extraordinary knowledge, and using such bold original language—such an hypothesis contradicts the whole psychology of the Christian consciousness, and the real defenders of the genuineness of the Epistle should not be ashamed to confess it openly out of their Christian consciousness."

[Ver. 19. Wordsworth: "A forger, personating St. Peter, would have magnified the importance of the supernatural visions vouchsafed especially to him whose character he assumed. He would have exalted those revelations above prophecy. But the Apostle, whose characteristic is humility, is not "elated by the *greatness of his revelations*," but wisely and soberly commends *the ordinary means of grace*, which *all* Christians, of every age and country, possess in the sacred Scriptures, as of more cogency and value for their assurance and growth in grace, than any extraordinary visions which were vouchsafed personally to himself."—M.]

4. We should consider the Transfiguration of Jesus not only as a miraculous testimony in favour of His Divine mission for the disciples, but also as a seal set to His glory for Himself. See Stier, II., 198; Lange on Matt. xvi. 28. 17. 1; Beck, *Lehrwissenschaft*, I., 512.

5. De Wette thinks it strange that the author, in his argument, verses 19–21, does not quote the speeches of Christ Himself concerning His coming, as recorded by the synoptists; that ch. iii. 16, shows that he must have been acquainted with them, and that he passes them by because the rapid succession of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the advent of Christ announced in them, had not been verified. But this remark proceeds on wholly false premises, and it formed part of the Apostle's plan to advert not to the testimony of Christ, which might have been disputed by the scoffers, and of which the adversaries, at all events, did not think very highly, but to the testimony of eye-witnesses of Christ.—Delitzsch, *Psychol.*, 812: "The manner of the revelation of prophecy is not always ecstatic; it may also consist only in that the willing, the thinking and the feeling Spirit-life of the prophet in a state of full and waking self-power is raised and borne along by a gentle, Divine influence, which he (and this is indispensable) is able clearly to distinguish from the working of his own spirit."

6. Those who, like many adherents of separatistic tendencies, take so one-sided a view of prophecy that they place it alongside, or even above the work of Christ, prove that the day has not yet dawned to them, and that the morning-star has not yet risen in their hearts. But the pretext that the day has dawned, says Roos, should not cause men to despise the word of prophecy; they should rather inquire whether it is day?

[7. Wordsworth: "Herein consists the *probationary use* of prophecy, viz., to try the faith and exercise the vigilance and patience of *believers*, and to make *unbelievers* themselves to become *witnesses* to the truth, and *instruments* in establishing it. *If* prophecy had been ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως, if its *interpretation* had been declared at the same time with its *delivery*, then none of those moral and probationary purposes would have been answered. The fulfilment of prophecy in a manner *contrary* to all previous expectation, proves the prophecy to be Divine."—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The Apostle's motto is that of his Master: "I must work . . . . . while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work."—The nearness of departure a powerful motive of working for the Lord.—"Those who in unbelief despise the revelation of God, fall superstitiously into fables," 2 Thess. ii. 11, Besser.—Christianity is objectively given and revealed from on high, and infinitely remote and different from all human devices, subjective opinions, and personal imaginings.—The testimony of the prophets and the Apostles two immoveable pillars for the support of the truth of the Gospel.—Dawn in the conversion of a sinner.—When does the morning-star arise in the heart? The true key to understanding the word of prophecy.—The secret of the true interpretation of the sacred Scriptures.

Starke:—Teachers must not desist from teaching, exhorting and admonishing, 1 Tim. iv. 13.—Grow not weary in exhorting one another. Foremost among good works is the work of saving souls from the burning, Jas. v. 19. 20. The op-

portunity is daily at hand; we must not wait for to-morrow.—There is nothing more certain than death, nothing more uncertain than the time of death. Happy is the man who daily lives as if he were to die to-day, Eccl. ix. 12.—It cannot be denied that God by some peculiar grace announces to some the time of their death, not indeed in virtue of immediate revelation, but in virtue of some deep impression conveyed to the heart; but this happens hardly to one in a thousand: dear friend, wait not for it, but prepare betimes.—The good which hearers have heard from their teachers, or seen in them, they should diligently remember after their decease, Heb. xiii. 7.—Those who run after will-o'-the-wisps, will sink into morasses. Christians are on their guard against such lights. Christ and His word the true Light on our ways, John viii. 81.—Those who seek to glorify Christ in others, and desire to fill worthily the office of glorifying Him in a manner worthy of the Holy Ghost, must have experienced with Christ (although in an inferior degree, and in a different yet true manner,) the power and glory of Christ in themselves, and be able to speak according to the Holy Scripture from their own experience (2 Cor. iv. 6).—With those who suffer themselves to be found in Christ through faith, God is as well pleased as with Christ Himself. For He has been made righteousness unto us, so that in Him we are considered righteous, 2 Cor. v. 21.—O man, that art by nature dark, suffer thyself to be made a bright and shining light through the right use of the word of God, or thou wilt not see the light of heaven, John v. 35.—Whatever remains as yet dark to us in the word of prophecy, shall hereafter become all light, if not in this present time, yet, according to the promise in Dan. xii. 4. 9. 10, when Christ, the true Morning Star, shall arise on that great day both of judgment and light, 1 Cor. xiii. 12.—It is enough to have learnt something from the word of God. As the light of day grows more bright after dawn, so also the knowledge of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ must grow and increase.—Holy Scripture does not contradict itself. Though it seem so, it is not so. Compare the one with the other, and you will find the most beautiful agreement.—God uses holy (sanctified) men in His service, so that those who would be His instruments, must also be His temples and work-shops.—Reasonable proof of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost: He spake of future things by the prophets, which things, for the most part, have come to pass; but this is solely a work of the omniscient God.

Gerhard:—There is no other access to reconciliation with God and to forgiveness except through the Son, Is. xlii. 1; for Christ's sake and through Christ only are we made partakers of those blessings.

Roos:—Woe to him, whose works, words and writings cause others to sin, even after his death. Happy he, whose works, words and writings bear good fruit, even after his death. Such an one's reward of grace will be great.

Lisco:—Pastoral fidelity even unto death.—The legacy of a departing pastor.—The firm foundation of the citizenship of the heavenly kingdom.

Kapff:—The firm reason of our faith. This reason rests, 1. on the outward testimony of the Apostles and the miracles of Christ; 2. on the inward testimony of the Holy Ghost.

Staudt:—How firmly Christians may step forward in their faith, 1. in all that depends on the coming of Jesus in the flesh; 2. in all that depends on the coming of Jesus to glory.

[On Ver. 15.—*Illustration:*—When Socrates was about to take the poison, to which the Athenian judges had condemned him, Crito asked him, "But how shall we bury thee?" Socrates replied, "As you please, if you can take me, and I do not elude your pursuit." Then gently smiling and looking at us he said: "Friends, I cannot persuade Crito that I am that Socrates who now converses with you . . . . , but he thinks that I am he whom he shall shortly see dead, and asks me how I would be buried. I have already declared that after I have drunk the poison, *I should no longer remain with you, but shall depart to certain felicities of the blessed.*" Plato, *Phædon*, 64. —M.]

[Secker:—We find in multitudes of places, from the earliest book of Scripture to the latest, supernatural impulses and illuminations ascribed to the Spirit of God: Gen. vi. 3; xli. 38; Numb. xi. 25. 26; xxiv. 2; 1 Sam. x. 10; 2 Kings ii. 9, etc.: 1 Chron. xii. 18; 2 Chron. xv. 1; Neh. ix. 30; Ezek. ii. 2; Zech. vii. 12; Rev. i. 10; ii. 7; iv. 2, etc.; we cannot doubt, therefore, but they proceed from Him always, though sometimes it is not expressly affirmed. So that we are to honour the third Person as the immediate inward instructor of men from the foundation of the world; as Him who hath admonished, reproved and striven with the wicked; who hath warmed and cheered the hearts of the pious in all times with the manifestations of God's will, with declarations of His favour, with precautions against unseen dangers, with promises of deliverance from the heaviest afflictions, with His presence and guidance in the most intricate difficulties." —M.]

[On Ver. 21.—See Bp. Hurd's *Sermon on False Ideas of Prophecy*, and the whole volume will be found a most valuable aid to students of the difficult subject of prophecy. It is entitled "*An Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies*," etc. vol. 5 of the works, but also published separately. See also Dr. McCaul's Essay on Prophecy in "*Aids to Faith*," Bp. Ellicott's Essay on Scripture and its Interpretation, in the same volume, and Canon Wordsworth's Essay on the Interpretation of Scripture, in the volume "*Replies to Essays and Reviews*."—M.]

CHAPTER II. 1–10*a*.

Analysis:—Warning against the false prophets with reference to their inevitable punishment, illustrated by three examples.

1 But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false
teachers among you, who[1] privily[2] shall bring in damnable heresies,[3] even[4] denying
2 the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many
shall follow their pernicious ways,[5] by reason of whom the way of truth[6] shall be evil
3 spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchan-
dise of[7] you: whose judgment now of a long time[8] lingereth not, and their damnation
4 slumbereth not. For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast *them* down to
5 hell, and delivered *them* into chains[9] of darkness, to be reserved [10]unto judgment; And
spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth *person*, a preacher of righteous-
6 ness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; And turning the cities of
Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned *them* with an overthrow, making *them* an
7 ensample unto those that after should live ungodly; And delivered[11] just Lot, vexed
8 with the filthy conversation[12] of the wicked: (For that righteous man dwelling among
them, in seeing and hearing, vexed *his* righteous soul from day to day with *their* un-
9 lawful deeds:) The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation,[13] and to
10 reserve the unjust[14] unto the day of judgment to be punished: But chiefly them that
walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government.

Verse 1. [[1] οἵτινες of a class, not simply identifying the individuals. Alford.—M.]
[[2] παρεισάξουσιν, to bring in by the side of (παρὰ), introduce surreptitiously.—M.]
[[3] αἱρέσεις, heresies, *i. e.*, self-chosen doctrines repugnant to the truth.—M.]
[[4] Both ἀρνούμενοι and ἐπάγοντες are to be connected with παρεισάξουσιν. They are not, however, co-ordinate to each other; as ἐπάγοντες must be annexed to the clause οἵτινες . . . ἀρνούμενοι. Winer, p. 368.—M.]
[German: But there arose also false prophets among the people . . . . who privily shall bring in self-chosen doctrines of destruction, and deniers of the Master who bought them, people that bring upon themselves swift destruction.
Translate: But there were . . . . heresies of destruction and denying . . . .—M.]

Verse 2. [[5] ἀσελγείαις, A. B. C. K. L. Cod. Sin., ἀσελγίαις. Rec., ἀπωλείαις.—M.]
[[6] A., Cod. Sin. (?) read δόξα for ὁδὸς.—M.]
[German: . . . . their licentiousness . . . .—M.]

Verse 3. [[7] Cod. Sin., ἐκπορ. (** ἐνπορ.).—M.]
[[8] ἔκπαλαι, *ex olim*, Bengel.—M.]
[German: And snared in covetousness . . . . deceive you.
Translate: And in covetousness . . . . make merchandise of you . . . .—M.]

Verse 4. [[9] σειροῖς, A. B. C. Cod. Sin.: σιροῖς ζόφοις (** ζόφου); Rec., al., σειραῖς.—M.]
[[10] Rec., al., τετηρημένους; A. C. ** al., κολαζομένους τηρεῖν; Cod. Sin., κολαζομένους τηρῖν. B. (*Mai*) C.* K. L., Alford. "The readings are in great confusion from the combined influence of Jude and v. 9 below." Alford.—M.]
Dietlein prefers the reading, τετηρημένους—those which once should have been reserved? Lachmann: κολαζομένους τηρεῖν.
[German: . . . . but cast them in bonds of darkness into hell, and committed them, in order to be reserved unto the final judgment.—M.]

Verse 5. [German: . . . . and preserved only Noah . . . . the herald of righteousness.
Translate: . . . . but preserved Noah, preacher of . . . .—M.]

Verse 6. [German: . . . . condemned them to overthrow, laying down an example of warning for those . . . .
Translate: . . . . laying down an example of those.—M.]

Verse 7. [[11] ἐῤῥύσατο, Rec., A. B. ** C., al. ἐρύσατο, B. *, Alford.—M.]
[[12] τῆς ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς—one idea. Behaviour in licentiousness—licentious behaviour.—M.]
[German: . . . . righteous Lot . . . . of the lawless.—M.]

Verse 8. [German: For in seeing and hearing . . . . distressed his righteous soul at (on account of) their immoral deeds.—M.]

Verse 9. [[13] πειρασμῶν, Cod. Sin. (*).—M.]
[[14] ἀδίκ. δὲ πεφυλασκισμένους (** *improb.* πεφ.) εἰς. Cod. Sin.—M.]

Verse 10. [German: . . . . in lust of defilement, and despise government.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection:—The Apostle, having exhorted them to give attention to the prophecy of Holy Scripture, ch. i. 19, now warns them against the false prophets, delineating their character and adverting to their fearful end. As he often takes up the words of our Lord in the first Epistle, so he doubtless alludes here to passages like Matt. xxiv. 11. 12; vii. 15: "Beware of false prophets." He makes the transition with reference to the false prophets in Israel, in order that the believers to whom he wrote might not be alarmed at the appearance of erroneous teachers. Paul also had prophesied concerning such erroneous teachers, Acts xx. 29. 30. Those seducers are referred to in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, the first of John, and the book of Revelation, but especially in the Epistle of Jude. In those writings they are mostly described as already existing.

VER. 1. **But there were false prophets also—destruction.**—Besides those holy men of God, there were also false prophets among the people; the history of Ahab shows this, the books of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel prove it more particularly, and ver. 15, below, gives an example in the case of Balaam.—ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι found here only, formed analogously to ψευδολόγος, 1 Tim. iv. 2; and ψευδοπροφῆται. [Alford remarks that ψευδο, in the latter, is ambiguous, the word being either subjective=pretenders, not real prophets, or objective=prophesiers of false things; cf. for the latter, Jer. xiv. 14, LXX., ψευδῆ οἱ προφῆται προφητεύουσιν . . . .; ib. 15; xxiii. 25.—M.] Dietlein: "Not a prophet or teacher who prophesies or teaches falsehood, but one who is not a prophet and yet falsely pretends to be one, cf. 2 Cor. xi. 13; Rev. ii. 2.—[Better make ψευδο, in ψευδοδιδάσκολοι, ambiguous, and understand not only unauthorized pretenders, but also teachers of falsehood.—M.]—παρεισάξουσι, not to bring forward, but to bring in beside, introduce secretly. In Jude occurs the similar term παρεισέδυσαν, they crept in through a false door. Bengel: "Beside the salutary doctrine of Christ."—Αἵρεσις from αἱρέω, a doctrine, a school, a sect. In the New Testament it is applied to the religious parties among the later Jews, contending with one another, Acts v. 17; xv. 5; xxvi. 5; in a bad sense, ch. xxiv. 5. 14; xxviii. 22. So especially, Titus iii. 10. "A man that is an heretic . . . . reject." It denotes voluntary, deliberate deviating from purely Christian articles of belief, leading to divisions in the Church, cf. Herzog, *Real. Encycl.* Art. *Häresie.*—Ἀπωλείας intensifies the idea of αἱρέσεις. Not all heresies are equally pernicious, not all lead so decidedly to destruction. [Doubtful whether this distinction can be drawn; it certainly does not pertain *ad rem;* these false teachers, who surreptitiously bring in false teaching by the side of the true faith, bring upon themselves destruction. Their end is destruction, cf. Phil. iii. 19.—M.]

Deniers of the Master that bought them.—Winer assumes that the two Participles ἀρνούμενοι and ἐπάγοντες are not coördinate to each other, but that καὶ—ἐπάγοντες is to be connected with the principal verb thus: "Who shall bring in corrupting heresies, and also, denying the Lord, bring upon themselves swift destruction;" too artificial. Others take καί for *even*, "*even* denying the Lord," but this use of καί cannot be substantiated. Huther proposes to take the Participle ἐπάγοντες as the *verbum finitum*, but without any analogy. The construction, however, becomes quite simple by taking the three Participles coördinate and alike dependent on ἔσονται, and making ἐπάγοντες to refer to the two classes of seducers, without distinguishing them from each other. This precludes the necessity of changing the construction while καὶ retains its usual signification. The second form of seducers is a species of the former. The terms παρεισάξουσιν and ἐπάγοντες correspond: they introduce their errors by stealth, but they draw upon themselves open and manifest destruction. [The reader has Fronmüller's construction in the translation, and may think it less artificial than awkward. The construction of Alford (who takes καὶ as the simple Copula, and regards ἀρνούμενοι as standing in the place of the finite verb, coördinate with παρεισάξουσιν, followed, as a consequence, by ἐπάγοντες κ. τ. λ.) seems least difficult; he renders "and denying the Master who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction."—M.]

Of the Master that bought them.—δεσπότης denotes an absolute ruler [an autocrat,—M.] of bondmen or slaves. It is used of God the Father, Luke ii. 29; Acts iv. 24; Rev. vi. 10. Here the context requires us to apply it to Christ, cf. Jude 4, and Rev. i. 8, where Christ is called the Almighty. This term suits ἀγοράζειν better than κύριος.—1 Peter i. 18, has λυτροῦσθαι for ἀγοράζειν, the former of which indicates the infinitely precious ransom, generally ἐξαγοράζειν, to buy back from, out of, Gal. iii. 13; iv. 5; Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5. The simple ἀγοράζειν occurs at 1 Cor. vi. 20; Rev. v. 9; xiv. 3. 4. Calov: "The ransom is the blood of Christ, Matt. xx. 28. He, to whom it has been paid, is God, who chiefly held us in prison, whereas the devil is only His prisonkeeper, from the hands of whom Christ has delivered us, Eph. v. 2; Heb. ix. 14. God in virtue of His justice required a ransom for our deliverance; in virtue of His mercy He accepted the ransom, which Christ paid for us."—Gerlach says: "These erroneous teachers had already become Christians, they had already experienced the saving effects of redemption, and had really left the service of the devil in Judaism or Paganism for the service of Christ." In support of this view v. 21 may be cited. But ἀγοράζειν is generally used to denote absolutely the vicarious satisfaction of Christ extending to all men, and consequently also to these false teachers; it is not used with the limitation that the effect of it has been experienced, as Calvin maintains, cf. 1 Tim. ii. 6; Eph. v. 2; Heb. ix. 14. Gerhard makes use of the illustration of a Christian ruler who pays a certain ransom for the redemption of prisoners into the hands of the Turkish Sultan. Those prisoners are truly redeemed, although they should refuse to accept the benefit of their liberation and continue in their bonds.

Deniers of the Master.—Their wickedness is the more enormous, because they deny their greatest Benefactor, in the service and confession of whom they ought cheerfully to die. The manner of their denial is not further defined. Bengel adds: "By their doctrine and works." Perhaps it is the same kind of denial as that of the false teachers in 1 Jno. ii. 23; iv. 2; v. 12; 2 Jno. 7. 9. The denial of the historical Christ, at once God and Man in one Person, as held and afterwards developed by the Gnostics into an anti-christian doctrine, partly with highly dangerous practical consequences.—Their denial may have had particular reference to the virtue of His sacrificial death and to His royal power over us, as His bondsmen.—[St. Peter, in inditing these words, doubtless felt deeply his own conduct in this respect, for notwithstanding the warning of Jesus, he denied Him *thrice* under the most painful circumstances. Matt. xxvi. 70. 72.—M.] ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν; ἀπώλεια, destruction, ruin in temporal and eternal death. This will be sudden, cf. ch. i. 14; their end will be attended

with terrors, Ps. lxxiii. 19. Destruction shall overtake them swiftly, 1 Thess. v. 8, just as the coming of Christ will be sudden.

VER. 2. **And many shall follow after their licentiousnesses.**—Cf. Matt. xxiv. 11. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 17. Errors, particularly those which give free scope to the flesh, are very contagious. [For an account of the Gnostic false teachers see below under Doctrinal and Ethical, No. 4.—M.] ἀσελγείαις, licentiousnesses, dissolute habits, unclean living. We see from v. 19 that a false liberty [really *libertinism.*—M.] was the gospel of those false teachers. They confounded Christian liberty with unbridled license. The roots of the bold antinomian tendency, which we find in the second century among the Carpocratians and other Gnostics, descend to the middle of the first century. "The haughtiness of false spirituality and unbridled sensuality with them went hand-in-hand." Gerlach. De Wette exhibits gross confusion in the remark that "αἱρέσεις being called here all of a sudden, ἀσέλγειαι, can only be explained from Jude 4."

By reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.—δι' οὓς; refer the relative to those who are seduced. The way of truth is an expression taken from the Old Testament, cf. Gen. xxiv. 48; Ps. cxxxix. 24; Jer. xviii. 15; Amos viii. 14. The right manner of worshipping and serving God. So Acts xix. 9. 23. As a way to a traveller such is true religion to us men. It is evil spoken of among the heathens and the worldly-minded [Bengel: "*ab iis qui foris sunt, discrimen ignorantibus verorum et falsorum Christianorum.*"—M.] who charge Christianity with the sins of false Christians. "They are wont to say: Look at the fruits of the Christian religion! The inference, although false, does harm, because it confirms those who draw it in their aversion to the truth and to Christ Himself." Roos.—Peter in his first Epistle, ch. iv. 14, and Paul in Rom. ii. 24 (cf. Jas. ii. 7) allude to this evil speaking. [Oecumenius describes the Nicolaitans and Gnostics as most "unholy in their doctrines and most licentious in their lives." Clem. Alex. states as a reason for his own writing, that false teachers, professing the name of Christians, and yet living shameless lives, have brought infamy (βλασφημίαν) upon the Christian name, even among the Gentiles, and that it was necessary to disabuse their minds of this illusion, and to vindicate the Gospel of Christ. See Wordsworth, who is very rich in illustrations on this subject.—M.]

VER. 3. **And in covetousness with feigned words they will make merchandise of you.**—ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ; not only the lust of money, but also the lust of honour and pleasure. 'Ἐν is significant and denotes that they were sunk and immersed in it.—Πλαστοῖς λόγοις, another expression characteristic of Peter, with speeches deceitfully conceived and invented ["speciously fashioned in fair forms so as to allure and deceive," Wordsworth; Wetstein quotes Artemid. 1, 53, πλάσσειν δοκεῖ. . . . . ἀγαθὸν ῥήτορσι. . . . . καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπατεῶσι, διὰ τὸ τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα δεικνύειν τὰς τέχνας ταύτας.—M.] Cf. ch. i. 16; Rom. xvi. 18. Perhaps the reference is to fictitious stories of the life of Jesus and the Apostles.—'Εμπορεύεσθαι, to trade (Jas. iv. 13), to import goods, to traffic, to make gain of, to overreach, cheat, cf. Hos. xii. 1; Prov. iii. 14; to deal in a thing, and to acquire a thing by traffic, is construed with the Accusative. Winer, p. 255, German ed., quotes from Josephus: ἐμπορ. τὴν ὥραν τὴν τοῦ σώματος, to trade in the beauty of the body; and from Philo: ἐνεπορεύετο τὴν λήθην τῶν δικαστῶν, he made profit of the forgetfulness of the judges. Hence Winer inclines to the rendering, "they will seek to get profit out of you, to make gain of you," or as Dietlein puts it, "they will cheat you" (*beschachern*).—[The 6th ed. of Winer, Engl. Transl., does not contain these quotations. Winer says plainly, p. 286, that the word here means, "make merchandise of you."—M.] Gerlach: "They will sell you for coin the doctrines of their own inventing," cf. 1 Tim. vi. 5; Tit. i. 11. The equally proven sense, "to cheat, to deceive," seems to be most simple.

For whom judgment from of old lingereth not.—οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι. De Wette thinks it necessary to connect κρίμα and ἔκπαλαι, as if it were the judgment from of old decreed and predicted (Jude 4); for, taken with the verb, it would contain a contradiction; a judgment long since hastening! Dietlein defends this sense, saying that both the promises and the threatenings are from of old in process of continual fulfilment, although their final fulfilment is long delayed, ch. iii. 9. But this cannot be the meaning of the Apostle, for he speaks of a ταχινὴ ἀπώλεια; the sense is rather: "for whom, according to an old experience, the judgment is not dilatory." De Wette's rendering, at any rate, is inadmissible; for it would require ἔκπαλαι before κρίμα. [Alford renders "for whom the sentence from long since is not idle"—after Bengel: "*non est otiosum,*" who explains: *i. e.,* "*plane viget unum idemque est judicium super omnes peccantes, quod in animo Judicis sine intermissione agitatur dum erumpit: et in iis, qui puniti in Scriptura memorantur, ostenditur quid ceteros maneat; tametsi peccantes putant, illud cessare ipsique dormitant.*"]

And whose destruction slumbereth not.—An original expression, peculiar to Peter. It is generally used only of men, as is shown in the passage from Plato cited by Huther: μηδὲν ἐᾶσθαι νυστάζοντος δικαστοῦ. Gerlach: "Punitive judgments live in God's immutable decree and break forth at the appointed time, and the specific instances recorded in history teach us what is in store for all. God is awake as the Judge, while He seems to be sleeping; but they, the recreants, sleep the sleep of security, while they seem to be awake in undisturbed activity and work." Hugo extends the expression to stings of conscience, which form already a part of hell, in Gerhard, p. 195.

VER. 4. **For if God spared not the angels that had sinned.**—Now follow three examples in illustration of ἔκπαλαι, which clearly exhibit the punitive justice alongside the saving justice of God.—εἰ γάρ. Winer, de Wette and *al.* assume here the existence of an anacoluthon; but the apodosis of the three protases [1.—εἰ γάρ; 2. καὶ ἀρχ. κόσμ; 3. καὶ πόλεις.—M.] occurs at v. 9, although couched in more general terms than might have been expected, respect being had to the exhibition of Divine justice to the pious.

Spared not.—Bengel: "Severe judgment is announced upon those of whom we should have expected that they would be spared." Complete the sentence thus: "If He did not spare those who stood higher and enjoyed greater dignity, much less will He spare the less." [But in order to bring this out ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων should be rendered *without the article*, viz.: "For if God spared not ANGELS *having sinned*," then supply, "much less will He spare these false teachers."—M.]

That had sinned.—In Jude 6, we have the addition, "who kept not their principality, but left their own habitation," or according to Stier, "who left their original true dominion and dignity," cf. Jno. viii. 44. Dietlein supposes on untenable grounds that vv. 4 and 5 belong together, and that Peter therefore stands up as an authority that Gen. vi. 2, refers not to the Sethites, but to angels; that he alludes more particularly to that last form of the development of sin when they entered into sexual relations with the daughters of men. As to Gen. vi. 2 we are unable to abandon the view that it relates to the amalgamation of the Sethites and Cainites, cf. Luke xx. 34-36. (Dettinger, *Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1835, 1; *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, 1858, No. 29.)—ἁμαρτησ. ἀγγ. above, probably would never have been interpreted otherwise than as setting forth the first fall in the realm of spirits, unless the passage, Jude 6. 7, had been believed to contain a reference to a πορνεία on the part of angels. But this view is founded on a false interpretation of τούτοις, which belongs not to the first mentioned angels, but clearly to the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, hence the masculine τούτοις. So Keil. It is alleged in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* that ἐκπορν. is only used to describe that kind of incontinence which violates an existing bond, that Gen. vi. refers to matrimony, while v. 3 discountenances altogether all reference to angels; that angels indeed denote sometimes fallen angels, 1 Cor. vi. 3 (against Stier); that Jude must not be interpreted by the *book of Enoch*, which, at the time when that Epistle was written, was perhaps not even extant (?). Hence the sinning on the part of angels in our passage can only be understood of the revolt of Satan and his associates, 1 Jno. iii. 8. 10. Kurtz, Delitzsch and *al.* interpret differently, while Keil (*Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1855, 2), defends our view of Gen. vi. 2 and 2 Peter ii. 4, on weighty grounds. The angel interpretation is found in Justin, Athenagoras, Cyprian and *al.;* also in the Syrian Church; in the Hellenistic and Palestinian synagogue; the Sethite interpretation is held by writers of the Middle Ages, but also earlier by Julius Africanus, Ephrem the Syrian and *al.;* also by Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin.

But cast them in bonds of darkness into hell and committed *them.*—σειρά from εἴρειν, to tie, bind, wind (?), a cord, a rope, a band, a noose, not a chain. Jude 6 has instead, δεσμός, a bond, a band, a fetter. [But the most authentic reading (see *Appar. Crit.* on v. 4) is σειροῖς from σειρός=σίφος or σιρρός, σιρός, properly *a cave where corn is stored* (Demosth.); *a pit, a wolf's den;* in that case render "dens of darkness." Cf. Alford and the Lexica.—M.]

Bonds of darkness.—The Book of Wisdom xvii. 18, in connection with the plagues of Egypt, uses the following expression: "ἁλύσει σκότους ἐδέθησαν, they were bound with indissoluble (?) bonds of darkness." As the bonds here are only a figure of the binding (?) power of darkness, so they are doubtless in our passage. Hence Bengel: "Darkness itself keeps them bound and is to them like a chain." Jude 5. 6 is more explicit: "he hath reserved them (bound) in everlasting chains under darkness." In both passages ζόφος, profound, extreme darkness, is used for σκότος. Jude 13. gives both words to express the highest degree of darkness. Although these bonds must not be taken literally, the darkness must not be confined to the darkness of their wickedness, but should be taken to denote real darkness, and the custody in which they are kept, a real custody. But this custody of the evil angels, says Bengel, is as yet preliminary, and the servants of hell may still remain on earth, Lke. viii. 31; Eph. ii. 2; Acts v. 8; xiii. 10; just as prisoners of war are sometimes permitted to go beyond the place of their confinement.—Ταρταρώσας, another term peculiar to Peter and not found in the LXX. Grotius rightly remarks that it denotes in Classic Greek to cast down into Tartarus, not to condemn to Tartarus. Nor does τάρταρος occur either in the N. T. or in the LXX.; the Greeks conceived it to be the lowest region of the earth, full of darkness and cold, not a region in the air, as Grotius, quoting Plutarch, supposes. So Tertullian, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret. It is=ἄβυσσος, while ᾅδης describes the abode of the dead in general, and γέεννα denotes the final place of punishment, the lake of fire, Rev. xx. 10-14; Mtth. xxv. 44, consequently the preliminary place of confinement and state of spirits, similar to what Sheol is for men. Huther connects παρέδωκε with σειραῖς; but the most simple construction is to connect ταρταρώσας with σειραῖς.

Being kept unto judgment.—Εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους belong together. A judgment has probably been passed upon them already, but the final judgment is still in store for them, cf. Matt. viii. 29; Rev. xx. 10; Jas. ii. 19. The Epistle of Jude amplifies "unto the judgment of the great day."—Τηρουμένους, as criminals that are now reserved for judgment [from a *present* point of view.—M.] Winer, p. 358.—"They are as unable to work themselves out of their darkness as is a prisoner to extricate himself from his chains."—Roos. But this author errs when he continues: "Just as the word *prison*, Job xxxvi. 13, and the term *hell*, 1 Sam. ii. 6, do not describe a place, but a condition, so the term *tartarize* with reference to the apostate angels does not describe a being locked up in a bad place, but rather the translation to a bad condition. These angels, be they wherever they may, are in a tartaric condition." The latter is true, but the abstraction, which precedes it, is not biblical.—Grotius sees in their being reserved a particular reference to their inability of going beyond the confines of the place assigned to them, and of doing any thing without permission. Stier calls attention to the deep irony which he detects in these words, whereby the Almighty holds those mighty ones up to derision, an irony of the initial judgment of their perverse doings. "They

would not keep their first estate and appointed habitation, and for this they must now, in virtue of the new power exerted against them by the Creator, be sadly kept and held fast unto guilt and punishment in the state of sin of which they made deliberate choice." This is perhaps too ingenious.

VER. 5. **And spared not the old world, but preserved Noah, the eighth person, a herald of righteousness.**—The second example, which is not given by Jude, is taken from the flood.

The old world, the world primeval. Dietlein: "Not absolutely the antediluvian race; it includes impersonal creation in so far as it surrounded that primordial race and being, as it were, its body, participated both in its corruption and punishment."—Ὄγδοον Νῶε. As the Apostle in 1 Peter iii. 20, attaches importance to the small number of the saved, so he does here in the case of Noah and his wife, three sons and their three wives; cf. on this use of the ordinal, Winer, p. 268. "The *eight* souls are contrasted with the most numerous world of the ungodly."—Bengel. Among the Patriarchs Noah is the tenth. There is here consequently no room for a prophetico-symbolical reference. The allusion is plainly to the small number of the saved at all times. [Wordsworth: "*Seven* is the number of completion and rest, the Sabbatical number: and in Enoch—the *seventh* from Adam—who *walked with* God, and did *not die*, but was translated from the turmoil of this world to a heavenly *rest*, and taken up to God, there appears to be a figurative adumbration of the *Sabbath of heavenly rest*, which remaineth to the people of God, Heb. iv. 9." Wordsworth has this note with reference to Jude, v. 14: "*Enoch*, the *seventh* from Adam," and thinks that Peter not only calls attention to the fact that Noah was saved with seven others, but that it places him as it were at the highest point of the climax.—M.]

Herald, preacher **of righteousness.**—He stood up against the world, denounced its unrighteousness and corruption, and exhorted it to repentance and conversion. Δικαιοσύνη. Huther: "Here not=righteousness of faith, but in the Old Testament sense=piety exhibited in obedience to the will of God." [Alford: The fact that Noah was thus a preacher of (moral) righteousness to the depravity of his age, is found alluded to in Joseph. *Antiq.*, I., 3. 1,—Ὁ Νῶεος δὲ, τοῖς πραττομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν δυσχεραίνων καὶ τοῖς βουλεύμασιν ἀηδῶς ἔχων, ἔπειθεν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον αὐτοὺς τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ τὰς πράξεις μεταφέρειν. *Bereschith Rabba*, XXX., 6, in Wetstein: "*κῆρυξ generationis diluvii, id est, Noachus.*"—M.]

Bringing the flood upon the world of the ungodly.—κατακλυσμόν from κατακλύζω, the deluge, confluence of the seas, cf. ch. iii. 6. מַבּוּל Gen. vi. 17.—Ἐπάξας, that which here is referred to the operation of God, is described in ch. ii. 1, as the guilt of man. The two should go together. [Human depravity the cause of Divine punishment.—M.]

VER. 6. **And burning to ashes the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah,** etc.—The third example is the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, cf. Jude 7.—Τεφρώσας from τέφρα, to burn to ashes.—Καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν. Dietlein and al. translate: "He condemned them actually by overthrow;" but we prefer rendering with de Wette, Huther and al.: "He condemned them *to* overthrow," like κατακρίνειν θανάτῳ, Matt. xx. 18; Mark x. 33.—Καταστροφή, cf. Gen. xix. 29, LXX.; 2 Tim. ii. 14; Jude amplifies, see v. 7.—Ὑπόδειγμα τεθεικώς = παράδειγμα: Jude has δεῖγμα, proof, figure, example, similitude, by which something is shown, cf. Jas. v. 10; Heb. iv. 11; viii. 5; John xiii. 15.—Dietlein strangely accounts for the use of the word by Peter's preference for ὑπό. The Perfect is very emphatic, being usually employed to denote an action completed, conceived as continuing in its effects, cf. Winer, p. 286. Bengel: "It was an irrefragable monument of God and of the Divine judgment."—Peter probably alludes here to 3 Macc. ii. 5.

VER. 7. **And delivered righteous Lot,** etc. —Καταπονούμενον, cf. Acts vii. 24, καταπονέω to wear down or tire out, to oppress, to harass beyond bearing (Alf.). Connect with ὑπὸ τῆς—ἀναστροφῆς. Others join ὑπὸ with ἐῤῥύσατο, rendering "out of the power of the bad conversation, under the influence of which he had been left," cf. Winer, p. 386.—Ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῇ, cf. 1 Peter i. 17.—Ἄθεσμος from θεσμός, a lawless, abandoned man, an antinomian; Bengel: "One who sins against nature;" Gerhard: "One who cares neither for right nor law." Only here and ch. iii. 17.

VER. 8. **For seeing and hearing the righteous man,** etc.—Parenthetical explanation of καταπονούμενον. Instead of the lawless tormenting his soul, it was he, the righteous man, who tormented his righteous soul.—Βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ belong to ἐβασάνιζεν. Wherever he turned and saw and heard, his soul was distressed at the wickedness that surrounded him. The sense here is similar to John xi. 33, where it is said of Jesus that He ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν. Dietlein: "Pain at one's own sin and at sin in general must not only be felt, but it must be a pain effected by the soul itself by reason of its turning to God."—Καταπονούμενον denotes the passive side of the pain. Bede connects δίκαιος with βλέμματι καὶ ἀκοῇ, and renders, "righteous because he did not suffer himself to be seduced by seeing and hearing."—Ἀνόμοις ἔργοις denotes the object of his distress.

VER. 9. **The Lord knoweth,** etc.—The apodosis is expressed in terms which apply the preceding examples not only to the lawless, but also to the pious.—Οἶδε. Knowledge and power combined. Κύριος, God the Father, according to v. 4.—εὐσεβεῖς, those who like Noah and Lot walk in faith in the living God.

Out of temptation, cf. 1 Peter i. 6; iv. 12; Matt. vi. 13; xxvi. 41; Luke viii. 13; Acts xx. 19; 1 Cor. x. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 9; Heb. iii. 8; Jas. i. 2; Rev. iii. 10.—**To deliver** (rescue,) cf. Jer. xxxix. 11. 18; xlv. 5; Ex. xviii. 10.—Κολαζομένους τηρεῖν.—Some take κολ. as Future, but Winer remarks that this is unnecessary, because the idea of the Future is already implied in τηρεῖν εἰς ἡμέραν; and the Present seems to have been chosen intentionally in order to show that their

punishment has already begun before the last judgment, cf. v. 4.

Ver. 10. **But chiefly those who go after the flesh.**—Jude v. 7, applies to the cities of the plain that which here is affirmed of the false teachers, viz., "Πόλεις . . . . ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας. Then in v. 8 it is said of the false teachers, that "likewise these . . . . defile the flesh." The comparison of the two passages will show that Jude amplifies and explains more fully than is the case in our passage. Stier interprets ἐκπορνεύειν with reference to the next following expression, as=*excess* of debauchery, to commit fornication out of all rule and order, beyond the limits of nature.—Ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, besides the horrors of sensuality, mentioned in Gen. xix. 5, and Rom. i. 27, refers evidently to the terrible sins of Sodom, which are enumerated in Lev. xviii. 22–24 among the horrors of the Canaanite heathen.—Our passage, on the other hand, is kept more in general; they seek their pasture in the flesh, in all manner of sensuality, they go in their infamous lust after every flesh.

In lust of defilement.—Ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ, not as Dietlein contends, "in lust, which is defilement," nor like Huther, "in lust after impure, polluting enjoyment," for where does μιασμός signify "polluting enjoyment?" It denotes defilement, stain, intercourse; connect it with the lust of concupiscence, 1 Thess. iv. 5; cf. Rom. i. 24–27; Eph. iv. 18, 19. Μιασμός also peculiar to Peter, and found only here in the New Testament. The description of these erroneous teachers reminds us of the Balaamites and Nicolaitanes in Rev. ii. 14. 15. 20. 24, in whom we recognize a stem of the fourfold Gnosticism of the second century. The circumstance that Peter now passes from the Future ἔσονται, v. 1, to the Present, must not be turned with de Wette into a reason for suspecting the genuineness of this Epistle. It may be accounted for in part by the Apostle's prophetically exalted frame of mind, for his fiery language shows him throughout as a φερόμενος ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου (cf. ch. i. 21,) and in part by the fact that the beginnings of those melancholy phenomena were already stirring. A forger of that capacity, which the Epistle presupposes, would have consistently adhered to the position he had taken at v. 1.

And despise lordship.—The first mark of those false teachers was the denial of Christ, ch. ii. 1; the second, covetousness, v. 8; the third, unbridled sensuality, ch. ii. 10; the last, arrogant despising of lordship. Κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας. Jude 8 has κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσι, which goes further than καταφρ., and is its consequence. Κυριότητα should be taken in a general sense; every and any lordship, whatever shall be and shall be called Lord, all Divine and human authority. So Stier. The word must not be limited to the dignity of Christ's lordship, because that had already been referred to v. 1. Dietlein applies it to Divine and superhuman powers, cf. Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16; ii. 18; Calvin, to earthly governments; Huther understands it of the Divine Being, because all power and authority repose in It; while with reference to the book of Enoch he explains δόξαι of the halo of glory surrounding the Being of God.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. We must not believe that those false teachers passed theoretically from the denial of Christ's redeeming grace and lordship to their moral libertinism and sensual enormities; the usual psychological course is rather that the heart is first corrupted, that the will is sold to sin, and that then the understanding becomes darkened.

2. The account of the angels given in v. 4 falls in with what the Bible teaches concerning angels in general, and must not excite in us the suspicion that it is apocryphal. It is doubtless founded on special revelations.

3. It is remarkable that anti-Christian phenomena, similar to those which threatened to overthrow the foundation of the Church in the beginning, spring up in our time. Stier refers more particularly to the rapidly spreading, fearful doctrines of the liberty of the flesh, and to the sins darkly skulking among the ungodly men of our time, especially to self-abuse.

4. [The principal heresies which sprung up in the Apostolical age, and developed themselves before the close of the first century, were:

1. *Simonianism*, or the opinions held by followers of Simon Magus, who taught that the three Persons of the Trinity were only three revelations of the same Person, and that Simon was the great power which emanated from the invisible God. Neander thinks it possible that the words of which Simon made use are contained in the apocryphal writings of the Simonians; see Jerome's *Comm. on Matth.*, 24: "*Ego sum sermo Dei* (ὁ λόγος), *ego sum speciosus, ego paracletus.*"

2. *Docetism*, or the doctrine of the Docetæ, who denied the *reality* of the human body of Christ, of His crucifixion, resurrection and ascent to heaven.

3. The doctrine of the *Nicolaitans*, who were noted for their licentiousnesses.

4. *Ebionism*, or the heresy of the *Ebionites*, who denied the Divinity of Christ, and maintained that He was a mere man, descended from Joseph and Mary.

5. The doctrine of the *Cerinthians*, who separated *Jesus* from *Christ*, and asserted that *Christ* descended from the *Father* into the person of *Jesus* at His baptism, in the form of a dove, preached during His ministry and worked miracles, that at the end of His ministry *Christ* flew away from *Jesus*, and did not *suffer death*, and that only the *man Jesus* was crucified.

These all "*denied the Lord that bought them.*"—M.]

5. [The following note of Wordsworth on evil angels embodies much valuable information. He says: This passage and the parallel in St. Jude 6, are two important texts on the *present condition* and *future destiny of evil angels*, and, consequently, of those persons who yield to their solicitations (cf. Matt. xxv. 41); these two texts declared:

1. That some angels sinned, and, as a penalty for their sin, were cast out of their *original habitation;* and,

2. That they have been committed in *custody to chains of darkness;* and that they are *now* being kept in them, and they there endure *some* punishment.

3. That they there *remain* even to the end of the world, and are *reserved* there for the *judgment of the great day*.

This appears also from the language of the devils themselves to Christ: "Art thou come to torment us *before* the *season* (καιροῦ) of judgment?" See Matt. viii. 29; Lke. viii. 31.

It is also evident from our Lord's words, describing the transactions of the great day. He there pre-announces that He will then say to them on the left hand, "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, that *hath been prepared* for the devil and his angels." They are, therefore, *not yet* cast into it.

It is also further apparent from the Apocalypse, revealing the casting of the devil into the *lake of fire*, as an event which has *not* taken place, but is yet *future*, Rev. xx. 10.

4. Comparing also these texts with other portions of Holy Scripture (1 Pet. v. 8), where the devil is compared to a roaring lion *walking about*, seeking whom he may devour; and (Rev. xx. 7), where Satan is described as loosed; and with the clear assertions of the Apostolic writings, describing his present liberty, energy, and influence, and designating him as "the prince of the power of the air" (ἀέρος, not αἰθέρος, Eph. ii. 2), and as "the god of this world" (2 Cor. iv. 4), we must conclude, that the *chains of darkness*, of which the Apostles St. Peter and St. Jude speak, and to which Satan and his associates are now confined, and in which they will be kept even *till the day of judgment*, are of such power as to restrain them from ever recovering their place in the *regions of light*; but *not* such as to prevent them from exercising great power over those persons in the lower world who *allow themselves* "to be taken captive by them at their will." See Wordsw. on Eph. ii. 2, and Rev. xx. 1-8.

The *book of Enoch* in like manner describes the evil angels as chained under the earth, till the day of judgment, when they will be cast into the lake of fire. See there ch. v. 16; x. 6; xiv. 4; xxi. 6; xxii. 4. Huther, p. 205. Cf., also, the *Catena* here, p. 91, where we read, that "at the *end* of the world, Christ will condemn to severer punishment those evil angels whom He has already shut up (in the abyss), and this He will do by casting them into everlasting fire." And Bede says here: "The apostate angels are yet to be condemned to the penalties of the final judgment; for although they have already received the nether regions of the murky air as a prison house, which, when compared with the bright glories of heaven, where they once dwelt, may be called an inferno, yet there is a deeper gulf below, which awaits them."

Accordingly, Jerome (in Eph. vi.) delivers it as the opinion of all the doctors of the Church, that "the devils have now their abode in the space between heaven and earth." And Augustine (*de Civ., Dei*, 8, 22) says, "that the devils dwell in this nether air, and being cast down from heaven for their sin, they are here pre-condemned as in a prison, suitable to their sin." And it is asserted as an article of the Catholic faith by Irenæus (1, 2), that "Jesus Christ will come again hereafter, to raise all bodies, and to judge all men, and to cast the rebel angels into everlasting fire." Justin Martyr, Origen, in *Numb., cap.* 22, Irenæus (5, 26), and Eusebius (4, 17), were of opinion "that the devils never openly blasphemed God before the publication of the Gospel, because they did not know till then what their *future* punishment would be," which opinion, whether true or no, shows that those ancient writers did not imagine that the devil has, as yet, been cast into hell. See the discourse of Joseph Mede; *Works*, p. 25, *Disc.* 5.—M.]

6. [The Gnostic teachers, says Wordsworth, despised and annulled κυριότητα, or *lordship*, in various ways:

1. With regard to *God the Father*, the Κύριος Κυρίω, LORD OF LORDS. Tillemont (2, pp. 17, 28), "all who took the name of Gnostics distinguished the Creator of the world from the God who reveals Himself by His Son; thus they made *two gods*," *i. e.*, they despised lordship by their *dualism*.

2. With regard to the *Lord Jesus Christ*. The *Ebionites*, as we have seen above, regarded Jesus as a *mere man;* the *Cerinthians* separated Jesus from Christ, and denied the Passion and Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*, by which He had acquired *universal lordship* over the Church and the world; they also invoked other mediators in place of Christ. They denied the Lord that bought them, and would not call Him *Lord* (Iren. 1, 1.).

3. With regard to *earthly rules*, by affirming themselves to be *free* to do all things, and to be exempt from all civil restraints. See more in Wordsworth, from whom this note is taken in a condensed form.—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The history of the Divine judgments an earnest monitor for all times.—The great comfort of the doctrine of universal redemption.—It is not enough that we teach sound doctrine, we must also denounce false teachers.—The rise of false teachers among the people of God is a historical necessity, 1 Cor. xi. 19; Matt. vii. 15.—In how many different ways may Christ be denied?—Which is the greatest gain?

CHRYSOSTOM:—"We admire Abraham, Lot and Moses, because they shone like bright stars in the darkness of night, because they were as roses among thorns, and as sheep among countless wolves."

The pious are distressed at the wickedness of the godless, 1. because it sullies the glory of God; 2. because it shows that they are tyrannized by Satan; 3. because it conduces to their condemnation.

GERHARD: — "The pious are not preserved from every distress and affliction, but they are rescued from them, so that the help of God is so much the more manifest. Thus it fared with Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, David, Daniel and the three men in the furnace."

STARKE:—Try the spirits whether they are of God, 1 Jno. iv. 1. Although they wear a rough garment (Zech. xiii. 4), ye shall know them by their fruits, and shall not take up with their party. —God has no pleasure in the destruction of the wicked, Ez. xxxiii. 11.—No wonder that the many take the broad way that leadeth to condemnation, because they find in it so many things

which are agreeable to the flesh.—A false and godless teacher is apt to have more followers than a true and godly teacher, but his condemnation also will be so much the greater, because he draws many people into his own destruction, Acts v. 36. 37.—To delay is not to annul [German proverb: *Aufgeschoben ist nicht aufgehoben.* —M.]. God is long-suffering; He forbears long, but His punishment is terrible. O! man, may His long-suffering lead thee to repentance, Rom. ii. 4.—The devils are condemned, but their full judgment, without any hope of redemption, is yet *future*, Matt. viii. 29.—Let us walk in the light, if we would escape the darkness of hell, 1 Jno. i. 7.—God has His elect and pious ones among the great multitude of the ungodly, whom He can and will miraculously preserve from universal punishment, Mal. iii. 17.—No country is so fertile, no city so beautiful, glorious and rich, but that they may be laid waste and destroyed, if their sins multiply.—God has many ways of saving His people: one way is His preserving them from communion with evil, and His strengthening them spiritually to endure evil with patience, 2 Cor. i. 6.—Should not the sincere servants of God be pained and grieved, if their teaching, prayers and exhortations notwithstanding, it fares ill with their congregations? Woe to you, over whom they sigh! their sighs will rest heavily on you, Jer. xiii. 17.—The sufferings of believers are only temporal; their redemption is at the door, 2 Cor. i. 9. 10. If not before, a happy death is sure to bring perfect redemption, Ps. lxxiii. 17. 19.—As there are degrees among believers, and as some excel others in spiritual gifts, and as they will be distinguished in glory, so there is also a difference in point of sin and punishment among the ungodly. Some excel others in wickedness; so the punishment of some will excel that of others, Heb. x. 29.

LISCO:—The enemies of the citizens of the kingdom.

ROOS:—If the kingdom of God cometh with power, the power of darkness is also astir. False teachers should stir up and incite the children of light diligently to search for the truth, and instantly and believingly to pray God for more enlightenment.

[VER. 4. *Critici Sacr. Thes.*, 2, 789, "*De malorum angelorum* Ταρταρῶσαι."

VER. 9. SOUTH, Three sermons, Works, vol. 6, pp. 121, 169, 209.

1. Deliverance from temptation, the privilege of the righteous.

2. Cause of the deliverance of the pious out of temptation.

3. Deliverance from temptation, why to be reputed a great mercy.—M.]

CHAPTER II. 10*b*–22.

ANALYSIS:—Further description of the false teachers; their radical corruptness and daring scoffing; their perilous state.

10*b* Presumptuous *are they*, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.[1]
11 Whereas angels, which are greater in power and might, bring not railing accusation
12 against them before the Lord.[2] But these,[3] as natural brute beasts[4] made[5] to be
taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not;[6] and shall
13 utterly perish[7] in their own corruption: And shall receive[8] the reward of unrighteousness, *as* they that count it pleasure to riot[9] in the day-time. Spots *they are* and
blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings[10] while they feast with you;[11]
14 Having eyes full of adultery,[12] and that cannot cease from sin;[13] beguiling unstable
15 souls: a heart they have exercised with covetous practices;[14] cursed children:[15] Which
have forsaken the[16] right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the
16 *son* of Bosor,[17] who loved the wages of unrighteousness; But was rebuked for his iniquity: the dumb ass speaking with man's[18] voice forbade the madness of the prophet.
17 These are wells without water, clouds[19] that are carried with a tempest; to whom the
18 mist of darkness is reserved for ever.[20] For when they speak great swelling *words*
of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, *through much* wantonness, those
19 that were clean[21] escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them
liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same[22] is he brought in bondage. For if after they have escaped the
20 pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord[23] and Saviour Jesus
Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with
21 them than the beginning. For it had been better[24] for them not to have known the
way of righteousness, than, after they have known *it*, to turn from[25] the holy com-
22 mandment delivered unto them. But[26] it is happened unto them according to the
true proverb, The dog *is* turned to his own vomit again; and, The sow that was
washed to her wallowing in the mire.

Verse 10. [[1] German: "The fool-hardy, haughty ones—tremble not to speak evil of glories."
Translate: "Darers, self-willed,—they tremble not while railing at glories."—M.]

Verse 11. [[2] German: "Whereas angels, although greater in strength and might, do not bear their judgment of railing (*i. e.*, the sentence passed on their railing) which is given against them before (—by) the Lord."—M.]
παρὰ κυρίῳ cancelled by Lachmann and Tischendorf.

Verse 12. [[3] Cod. Sin. reads αὐτοὶ for οὗτοι.—M.]
[[4] ἄλογα ζῶα—irrational animals.—M.]
[[5] γεγεννημένα, Rec. A[2], Sin; γεγεννημένα, A[1]. B. C., Theile.—M.]
[[6] ἀγνοοῦντες βλασφημοῦσιν, Cod. Sin.—.M.]
[[7] Rec., Sin., C[2], al., καταφθαρήσονται; καὶ φθαρήσονται, A. B[1], al., Theile, Alford.
Translate: "But these, as irrational animals, born naturally for capture and destruction, speaking evil of things which they know not, shall even perish in their corruption."—M.]

Verse 13. [[8] For κομιούμενοι, B., Cod. Sin., read ἀδικούμενοι.—M.]
[[9] Cod. Mosq. for τρυφήν, τροφήν.—M.]
[[10] ἀγάπαις, A. B. (Mai), Vulg., al.—M.]
So Lachmann, as in Jude 12. But it is more probable that a transcriber changed ἀπάταις into ἀγάπαις, than the reverse. ἀπάταις is sustained by A. C. G. K., al. αὐτῶν also, which is critically established, favours only ἀπάταις and not ἀγάπαις, as has been pointed out by Gerhard and de Wette.
[[11] Translate: "Receiving, as they shall (Alf.), the reward of unrighteousness. Deeming revelling in the daytime their highest (so German) pleasure, they are full of (German) spots and disgrace, revelling in their deceits, while they feast with you."—M.]

Verse 14. [[12] μοιχαλίας, A., Cod. Sin.—M.]
[[13] ἀκαταπάστους, A. B. ἀκαταπαύστου, Cod. Colbert.—ἁμαρτίαις, Cod. Sin.—M.]
[14] πλεονεξίας, A. B. C., Sin., al., Lach., Tisch. [πλεονεξίαις, Rec., Theile, al.—M.] Huther cites examples from the Classics for the constr. with Genitive.
[[15] Translate: "Having eyes full of an adulteress, and that cannot be made to cease from sin; luring unstable souls, having a heart practised in covetousness (Germ., selfishness), children of malediction."—M.]

Verse 15. [16] τὴν before εὐθεῖαν omitted by [A. B. C. K. L.] Griesb. [Alf.] al.
[[17] For βοσόρ, βεώρ, B.; βεώρσορ, Sin.—ὃς omitted by B.—M.]

Verse 16. [[18] Cod. Sin. omits ἐν before ἀνθρώπου.—M.]

Verse 17. [[19] καὶ ὁμίχλαι, A. B. C., Sin., al., Griesb., Tisch. Alf.—M.] ὁμίχλαι from ὁμίχω, mists, vapours. [νεφέλαι, Rec., L., Theile.—M.]
[[20] Εἰς αἰῶνα omitted by B.—M.] Lachm., Tischend.; it may have been inserted from Jude, [but found in Rec., A. C. L., al; and retained in German version.—M.]

Verse 18. [21] Rec. with A. B., al. reads ὀλίγως, Griesbach on good authority ὄντως, which appears to be the more difficult reading. [Cod. Sin., τοῦ ὄντως (** τοὺς ὀλίγως) ἀποφεύγ.—M.] Lach., Tisch., al. prefer ἀποφεύγοντας, being on the point of escaping.
[Translate: "Speaking great swelling words of vanity, they entice in lusts by licentiousness of the flesh those who were only just escaping (Germ., who were in truth escaping) from them who live in error."—M.]

Verse 19. [[22] Cod. Sin. omits καὶ after τούτῳ.—M.]

Verse 20. [[23] Insert ἡμῶν after κυρίου, Cod. Sin., A. C. L., al.—M.]

Verse 21. [[24] κρίσσον for κρεῖττον, Cod. Sin. κρεῖσσον, A.—M.]
[[25] εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἀνακάμψαι ἀπὸ τῆς, Cod. Sin.] εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ὑποστρέψαι ἀπό, Lachmann. [ἐπιστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς, K. L., Theile, al.; ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς, B. C., Alford, al.—M.]

Verse 22. [[26] Omit δέ after συμβέβηκεν, A. B., Cod. Sin.—M.] Lachm., Tischend.; it seems to be a later addition. [Rec., C. K. L., Theile, al. insert it.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vv. 10*b*. 11. **Darers, self-willed**, etc.—*τολμηταί*.—Here begins a new section. Peter anticipates the future here, as well as in the first Epistle. Before his prophetic eye, the false teachers, who were afterwards to arise, appear as already present. This word, peculiar to Peter, denotes bold, daring, audacious, or insolent men. [The word occurs only here, but is found in Joseph., B. III., 10, 12, and Thucid., I., 70; in the latter passage, the Corinthians describe the Athenians as *καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταί, καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταί*.—M.]

Αὐθάδεις from *αὐτός* and *ἁδέω*, self-willed, presumptuous persons, Tit. i. 7.—*Βλασφημοῦντες*, on the Participle, see Winer, pp. 357–372.—*Δόξας*, not: glorious attributes of God, but angelic powers, majesties, as is evident from the next verse and the Epistle of Jude. The reference is doubtless to the angels surrounding the throne of the Most High, cf. Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16.

[Wordsworth:—What are *δόξας* or *glories* here? Doubtless the word *δόξα* is chosen, as the word *κυριότης* before, for its large and general import. It signifies,—

1. The *μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα*, the excellent *glory*, the Divine Shechina of the Godhead itself, i. 17.

2. The *glory* of the *Incarnate Word*, Jno. i. 14; James ii. 1.

3. The *glory* of the *Holy Ghost*.

The false teachers blasphemed the *glory* of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, by disparaging the Creator and Redeemer, and by ascribing the work of the Divine Sanctifier to their own magical arts, and by calumniating the prophecies of Holy Scripture, given by His inspiration.

4. They denied the *resurrection of the flesh*, and thus they derogated from the future *glories* of Christ, when He "will come in His glory (Matt. xxv. 31) and in the glory of His Father" (Matt. xvi. 27), and when "He will be glorified in His saints" (2 Thess. i. 10); and in "their glorious bodies, fashioned to be like unto His glorious body," Phil. iii. 21. See 1 Pet. i. 11, the only other passage in N. T., beside Jude 8, where *δόξα* is found in the *Plural*, as here.

5. They spake evil of the *glory* of the *holy angels*. The Simonians represented them as the offspring of Simon Magus, who "was glorified by many as God." See *Catena* here, p. 98, where it is truly said, "Peter here refers to the Simonians, who blended licentiousness with ungodliness," and they traduced the holy angels as rebels against God; See Iren., I., 23, 1. And the successor of Simon Magus, Menander, called himself the Saviour, and affirmed that he could impart knowledge greater than that of the angels, Iren., I., 23, 5.

6. They spake evil of *earthly dignities*, which are images and *glories* of God's majesty (Rom. xiii. 1–3), and are even called gods (Ps. lxxxii. 6), as man himself is, in his headship over woman, 1 Cor. xi. 7.

7. They spake evil of the *glories* of the *natural world* (1 Cor. xv. 40), ascribing their creation to the operation of the *Demiurge*, hostile to the Supreme God.—M.]

Dietlein applies it both to the Divine dignity of Christ and to the angels, and afterwards adds that even Satan is included among the glories that are evil spoken of. Stier, with most modern commentators, explains: "The angels, although greater in strength and might, do not pass before the Lord a railing sentence on the majesties; they know and perhaps announce the judgment, but leave it in humility to the one Lord, aware that they, as well as the evil powers, are before His face; any other word of self-willed abuse appears to them as a railing of those who are as yet spared the executive judgment, and really as a railing of the power and long-suffering of God, and therefore they abstain therefrom." He agrees with Gerlach, who says: "Even if the Lord in His own presence charges them with the execution of the (preliminary) sentence on such high (evil) spirits, they do not utter it in the form of self-willed railing." But this interpretation is not without grave objections. 1. Δόξαι are made to denote angelic and demoniac powers; since, according to this view, κατ' αὐτῶν is referred to evil spirits, logical consistency requires that δόξας also be referred to them. But is it probable that these are called δόξαι, glories? This reminds one of *lucus a non lucendo*. The railing is to consist in saying that they are only phantoms and superstitious ideas. This would be denial, not railing. 2. The reference in v. 4, with which our passage is connected, being to evil angels, it would be very surprising to have in v. 11 an abrupt reference to good angels. The qualifying μείζονες applies much better to evil angels than to good ones, to whom it belongs as a matter of course, and its application to them would be rather weak. Moreover, ἄγγελοι here answer to the τολμηταί of the preceding verse, and we have, therefore, to assume a similar disposition in these. 3. Φέρειν κρίσιν, v. 11, is said to mean "to pass a sentence"; but it will be difficult to verify this rendering, although ἐπιφέρειν is used in the Epistle of Jude, 4. But would that be a railing judgment, a railing decision in the same sense, in which the false teachers pass it, if the good angels were to give a true, although a harsh judgment of the evil angels? For βλασφημεῖν means to defame one, to speak evil of one, contrary to the truth. 5. Οὐ φέρουσι is evidently related to οὐ τρέμουσι, and this relation would be entirely effaced if φέρειν were rendered to pass (judgment). These reasons could be overlooked only because it was thought necessary to expound this passage by the parallel passage in Jude. But this changes the true point of view. We must endeavour to explain our passage independently of that in Jude, and this leads to the result that the angels are evil angels, that φέρειν means to bear (Luther), and βλάσφημον κρίσιν=βλασφημίας κρίσιν, cf. Jude 9, the judgment on their railing at God. The sense is as follows: "The wrath of God and the judgment which God passes on them in judgment of their railing, are unbearable to the evil angels, who have stronger shoulders than those false teachers, how much more then ought these to tremble at blaspheming the angelic majesties, cf. v. 4." It is not known to us what those blasphemings were. It is evident from ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσι, v. 12, that the reference could not have been to terrestrial majesties, governments and princes.—Ὅπου=*cum*, where, whereas, 1 Cor. iii. 3.—κατ' αὐτῶν=καθ' ἑαυτῶν.—Παρὰ κυρίῳ, before the Lord, in the face of the Lord, or from the Lord, with Him the Judge, cf. Acts xxvi. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 20; Winer, p. 413. De Wette's remark that the sense in our passage is incoherent is superficial and unjust.

VER. 12. **But these, as irrational animals, etc.**—ἄλογα.—Evil angels know and feel the wrath of God; those false teachers are inferior to them, they are like animals that know nothing of a higher world. They are φυσικά, they belong altogether to the sphere of nature; it is as if they had no soul and still less a spirit. They are not led by reason, but only by their natural appetites, cf. Ps. xlix. 13. 21; cxli. 10. Some take φυσικά for φυσικῶς.—[Bede here excellently remarks that there is a resemblance between these false teachers and brute beasts, in that both are led by their *fleshly appetites* to fall into snares and destruction. Cf. *Bava Mezia*, quoted by Wetstein, p. 706: *Quidam vitulus, cum ad mactandum adduceretur, R. Judam accessit, caputque in ejus gremium reponens flevit. Sed ille, abi, inquit, in hunc finem creatus es.*—M.]

Γεγεννημένα.—This is their natural destination, for this purpose they are created, *i. e.*, to be caught by men, and to be killed for their use. Εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν, both to be taken passively, not actively.—"Peter may be supposed to allude to their falling as prisoners into the hands of the government, and their suffering punishment according to human laws." Roos. Ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσι βλασφημοῦντες, attraction for ἐν ἐκείνοις ἃ ἀγνοοῦσι, like חֵרֵף בְּ, 2 Sam. xxiii. 9, קִלֵּל בְּ, Is. viii. 21, Winer, p. 651. Dietlein sees in ἐν τούτοις the sphere in which the railing takes place, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 12. Therein lies the ground of their perishing, that which constitutes their guilt and distinguishes them from brute beasts.—Ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ φθαρήσονται. Φθορά is inward, moral corruption and the spiritual death to which it leads, cf. ch. i. 4. The verb denotes outward destruction and future condemnation.—Their outward destruction here is still followed by retribution hereafter, the reward of their unrighteousness.

VER. 13. **Receiving the reward of unrighteousness.**—Κομιούμενοι, cf. 1 Pet. i. 9. The participial sentences which follow must not be connected with ἐπλανήθησαν, which does not contain the leading thought of this paragraph, but they belong to what precedes and explain the unrighteousness of those false teachers, which unrighteousness should be taken in a general sense (cf. Lke. xiii. 27; Rom. i. 18). Some of these participles are subordinate to the preceding ones, *e.g.*, εὐωχούμενοι, but most of them are coördinate.

Deeming revelling in the daytime their highest pleasure.—Ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι.—They know no other pleasure than τρυφή, rendered by the Syriac, *deliciæ*, voluptuousness, revelling, luxurious living.—Τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ. Oecumenius=καθ' ἡμέραν, Lke. xvi. 19, daily. Others=momentary, transient well-living, as the day supplies it. So de Wette. Or: spending the day, without thinking of the future. So Dietlein

But all these renderings are contrary to grammatical usage. Gerhard:—the time of this present life, which compared with eternity, is only as one day. The right sense follows from a comparison with 1 Thess. v. 7: "They that be drunken, are drunken in the night." But these are so lost to all sense of shame, that they revel at noon-day. We may also cite the case of those heroes of drunkenness, who revel all day long, Is. v. 22. [The Gnostics were renowned for such excesses. Jerome (*adv. Lucif.*, p. 58) says, *tunc Nicolaus* DIU NOCTUQUE *nuptias facens obscoenas, etc.;* and Epiphanius, *haer.*, 25, gives one of their maxims, "that a man had no hope of everlasting life, ἐαν μὴ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν λαγνεύῃ."—M.]

They are full of spots and blemishes, revelling in their deceits, while they feast with you.—Σπίλοι, in Jude 12 σπιλάδες, from σπιλόω, to stain, to soil. Both are identical in point of meaning, only the one is an adjective, the other a substantive. Stains, spots on garments, or in the face, moral stain.—Μῶμος= blame, disgrace [disfigurements, causing shame. Alford.—M], peculiar to Peter. They are people full of spots and disgrace, who stain the body of Christ and themselves, Deut. xxxii. 5. The two words must not be connected with ἐντρυφῶντες, as de Wette maintains, but they stand by themselves.—Ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν, they revel in the gain of their deceits. The *abstr. pro concreto.* [A good sense may be obtained if the reading ἀγάπαις, cf. Jude 12, be retained. They called their gatherings ἀγάπαι, *love-feasts*, but they *were* occasions of revelry.—If ἀπάταις be retained, the remark of Windischmann (*Vind. Petr.*, p. 45) will be found useful: "St. Peter would not call these heretical feasts by an honourable name (ἀγάπας), but styles them ἀπάτας, and describes their true character by adding the word ἐντρυφῶντες." There is also a similar *paranomasia* or play on the words ἀπάτη and ἀγάπη in 2 Thess. ii. 10.—M.]—Συνευωχούμενοι from εὐωχία, ἔχω, ὀχή and εὐ, explained by Pollux, of public banquets.

VER. 14. **Having eyes full of an adulteress**, etc.—Dietlein has the curious notion that the allusion is to some female member of a house into which they had crept, who had already become the victim of their seduction. Μοιχαλίδος is more pregnant than the reading ὀφθαλμοὺς μεστοὺς μοιχαλίας, which evidently originated with later transcribers. Hornejus explains it well: "adulteresses dwell, as it were, in their eyes." But this does not yet account for the Singular. Respect is probably had to the harlot in Prov. ii. 16; vi. 24. Ἀκαταπαύστος connected with ὀφθαλμούς: full of ungratified lust of sin, insatiable in it. Another most pregnant term, peculiar to Peter, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 1. Lustfulness is reflected in their eyes.

Luring unstable souls—children of malediction.—Δελεάζοντες from δέλεαρ, a bait to allure and attract with a bait, as does a fowler to catch birds, or a fisherman to catch fish, Jas. i. 14. [Wordsworth: "A word twice used in this Epistle, see v. 18; and a metaphor likely to occur to St. Peter, the fisherman of Galilee, to whom our Lord said, Matt. xvii. 27, *βάλε ἄγκιστρον, cast a hook.*"—M.]

Ἀστηρίκτους, **cf. ch. iii. 16, a peculiar expression,** explained by Jerome thus: "Souls which are not yet strong through the love of Christ," and therefore easily turn hither and thither.—Γεγυμνασμένην, practised, exercised, schooled.—Πλεονεξίαις, covetousness in its various kinds and forms, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 3, especially also the lust of honour and enjoyment. Erasmus interprets it by *rapinae.*—*Children of malediction*, according to the Hebraism=persons devoted to and worthy of the curse, cf. 2 Thes. ii. 3: Ps. cix. 17, etc. Calov: "From the throat he passes to the eyes, the tongue, the heart, and the life."

VER. 15. **Having forsaken the right way they are gone astray.**—Gerhard gives the following connection: "He illustrates the covetousness of the false teachers by the example of Balaam, who once, by his love of lucre, suffered himself to be beguiled into cursing the people of Israel, cf. Jude 11." Another point of comparison, which is not made prominent here, is the commingling of the Divine and the worldly, hypocrisy and allurement to harlotry, Numb. xxv. 1. etc; xxxi. 16; Rev. ii. 14.—Τὴν εὐθεῖαν ὁδόν. This is the way of revealed truth, ch. ii. 2; of righteousness, ch. ii. 15. It is called sometimes the way of the Lord, Gen. xviii. 19; Judg. ii. 22; Acts xviii. 25; the way of peace, Is. lix. 8; Rom. iii. 17, the way of wisdom, Prov. iv. 11, the way of life, Prov. x. 17; the way of salvation, Acts xvi. 17.—They were consequently persons who at one time had taken the right way, but had now backslidden.—Πλανᾶσθαι, to go astray, to err, take a wrong way, a figure denoting the various by-roads into which they get, and the uncertainty which attends their aberration, cf. Matt. xxiv. 5; Jno. vii. 12; 2 Tim. iii. 13.

Following after the way of Balaam, etc.—Ἐξακολουθήσαντες, ch. i. 16; ii. 2; defines ἐπλανήθησαν.—Τοῦ Βοσόρ, the son of Bosor. Hebrew בְּעוֹר. ע is changed into σ, because some grammarians maintain that in the Babylonian pronunciation the ע was a kind of sibilant. צ and ע are often interchanged; so Gesenius and Ewald.—**The wages of unrighteousness.**—Gerhard: "The reward which the Moabite ambassadors carried in their hands, Numb. xxii. 7, are called *wages of unrighteousness*, because Balaam hoped to receive the money for an unjust and wicked work (the cursing of Israel)." Ἠγάπησεν, a mild term but suited to the circumstances. The sacred narrative does not explicitly refer to the covetousness of Balaam, Numb. iv. 22; he seemed inclined to shape his course wholly according to the will of God; but when the second embassy offered him greater gifts and honours, he induced the messengers to prolong their stay that he might once more inquire of the Lord whether he should go. v. 19. His dominant lust is also exhibited in v. 34. [See Bp. Butler's Sermon "Upon the character of Balaam."—M.]

VER. 16. **But was rebuked for his peculiar iniquity.**—Ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν, he received not punishment, but a rebuking conviction, as indicated below. Παρανομία=ἀδικία. He clearly knew that it was the will of God that he should

not curse the people: yet he resisted it.—Ἰδίας. Dietlein: "The perversion of the law peculiar to him, and the archetype of the same perversion in the false prophets." Far-fetched.—Huther arbitrarily takes it in the sense of αὐτοῦ. It rather denotes that the transgression was peculiar in that he transgressed the will of God, Numb. xxii. 12, while complying with His commandment, which gave him up to the counsel of his heart, ch. xxii. 20, 35.

A dumb beast of burden, etc.—Ὑποζύγιον, a yoke-beast, a beast of burden, especially an ass, Matt. xxi. 5, ἄφωνον, in antithesis to the human voice. The antithesis between ἄφωνον and ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον is designed to bring out the miraculous character of the incident.'—Ἐκώλυσε. De Wette says: "It was not the ass that forbade him, but the angel, Numb. xxii. 22. etc." But this is not a discrepancy between our passage and the Mosaic account, for God made use of that dumb animal to prevent his going onward, while the angel suffered him afterwards to pass on to punishment, as de Wette himself observes. Gerhard: "Balaam was able and ought to have seen, from so uncommon a miracle, that his way was perverse." In the Epistle of Jude, v. 11, two additional examples are given, that of Cain and that of the company of Korah; the reward of Balaam being only briefly introduced.—Παραφρονία, folly, senselessness, madness. It is madness indeed to fight against God, Ps. cix. 3; Acts v. 39. It is, says Luther, an unequal fight, if old pots will fight with rocks; for let it happen as it will, the pots will come to grief.—Προφήτου. The Mosaic account shows that revelations were made to him, Numb. xxii. 8. 13. 18. 19; xxiii. 5. 16; xxiv. 17. 16; but also that his soul was open to influences of the kingdom of darkness, ch. xxiv. 1. etc.; xxiii. 1. Ambrose, Gregory of Nyssa and Theodoret infer from the latter passages that he was a prophet of the devil. Compare on the enigmatical character of Balaam, Kurtz, *Geschichte des alten Bundes*, 455 [and Butler's *Sermon on the Character of Balaam*.—M.]

Ver. 17. **These are wells without water.**—Two figures are now introduced to describe the influence of the false teachers upon others. Calov sees here a reference to Jer. ii. 13, where God compares Himself to a fountain of living waters, and the idols, so much run after by the many, to broken cisterns, that can hold no water. - "They contain no water of wholesome wisdom and living consolation." Oecumenius: "They have lost the water of life." Augustine: "He calls them wells, because they had received the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, without water, because they do not live agreeably to their knowledge." Prov. x. 11 states the contrary. We are especially reminded of Prov. xxi. 6, the original of which refers to scattering mist, to dispersing vanity, cf. ch. xiv. 24; Is. xxxv. 7. Umbreit suggests the well-known mirage. The thirsty traveller in the desert perceives a moving sheen which he takes for a stream or a lake, hastens to it, but, reaching it, is bitterly disappointed, for it all dissolves into empty vapour.—Huss: "Where you find a well without water, you find dirt and mire. So these contain no water of inflowing grace, but the mire of wickedness. No wonder, seeing that they have forsaken the fountain of living water." They are not hallowing, but polluting wells.

Clouds driven along by a whirlwind.—Νεφέλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμενοι. Dietlein incorrectly renders fogs, alleging them to be clouds with the lateral idea of inward absence of clearness. [If the reading ὁμίχλαι be retained, render "mists." See *Appar. Crit.* Comm. in *Catena: οὐκ εἰσι, φησί, διαυγεῖς ὥσπερ οἱ ἅγιοι οἱ ὄντες νεφέλαι, ἀλλ' ὁμίχλαι, τουτέστι, σκότους καὶ γνόφου μεστοί, ὑπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ πνεύματος ἐλαυνόμενοι*.—M.] Λαίλαψ. Gerhard produces the definition of Aristotle, who describes it as a violent wind turning upward and downward, cf. Mk. iv. 37; Lke. viii. 23; LXX. Job xxxviii. 1; Jer. xxv. 32.—Ἐλαυνόμεναι, used of ships driven to and fro by strong winds, Jas. iii. 4, and of the possessed driven by demons, Lke. viii. 29. The parallel passage in Jude 12 reads: νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι (cf. Prov. xxv. 14) ὑπὸ ἀνέμων περιφερόμεναι, clouds which promise rain, but give none because they are chased away by the wind. Jude adds three other figures. Peter's point of comparison is different; with him the emphasis rests on ἐλαίνεσθαι, which is designed to denote the inconsistency, the wavering and unquietness of the false teachers. Huther says that νεφέλαι denotes inward emptiness.—Huss: "Clouds driven along by the wind produce a tempest and obscure the splendour of the sun, so in like manner those false teachers disturb the peace of souls and obscure the Sun of righteousness by the darkness of error."

For whom the blackness of darkness is reserved forever.—Οἷς ὁ ζόφος. De Wette observes that ἀστέρες πλανῆται, Jude 12, is here left out and that οἷς ὁ ζόφος is inappropriately put down; most unfair, for Peter as well as Jude use the figure with reference to the false teachers. Dietlein rightly replies that "if Peter had found ἀστέρες πλανῆται, which would be even more telling in connection with his οἷς ὁ ζόφος than νεφέλαι, he would hardly have omitted those words." [Add that darkness is predicable of clouds driven by the wind as well as of wandering stars; the charge of inappropriateness is therefore unfounded.—M.] The relative οἷς necessarily belongs to οὗτοι, not to πηγαί or νεφέλαι, which would require αἷς.

Blackness of darkness denotes extreme darkness, Matt. viii. 12; xxii. 13; xxv. 30.

Reserved.—Reverts to the judgment of the angels, ch. ii. 4; cf. 1 Pet. i. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 7, 17. Stier: "That blackness of the judgment is reserved, spared, laid in store for them which is due to the darkness of their sin." A dark life is justly punished with darkness, especially because of the seduction of so many souls.—Εἰς αἰῶνα, it is reserved for them down to the remotest periods in time to eternity, no matter what changes may take place with the earth and the world.

Ver. 18. **Speaking great swelling words of vanity, they entice**, etc.—Ὑπέρογκα from ὄγκος, bulk, exceeding bulk, swelling, figuratively, pride. Jude 16, has: τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα. Luther: "Proud words with nothing to back them," hollow, vain phrases, bombast. Want of mind, want of power and emptiness are generally concealed under a hollow sound of words.—Δελεάζουσιν, see v. 14.—Bengel: "They pretend, as if they were lights of the Church,

over-great things, but these wells, these clouds yield nothing.'—'Εν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκός. Gerhard: "These are the bait with which they attract others."—'Ασελγείαις in apposition with ἐπιθυμίαις. We may also translate with Huther: "They entice in the lusts of the flesh (*i. e.* insnared, in them, ruled by them) by licentiousness those, etc."—'Οντως in truth, in sincerity and not only in the mask of hypocrisy [but ὀλίγως=ὀλίγον, cf. *Appar. Crit.* seems preferable.—M.]—'Αποφυγόντας suits ὀλίγως better than ὄντως.—Τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους dependent on ἀποφυγόντας. Huther: "Those from whom the deceived persons had separated, non-christians, especially the heathen, who spend their life in error, ἐν πλάνῃ."

Ver. 19. **Promising them liberty**, etc.—The subject of their great swelling speeches turns especially on liberty, that is, on the false liberty of living as they pleased, of indulging the flesh to the full. Grotius refers to certain Gnostics, whom Irenæus reports to have boasted that their soul had been liberated from all moral restraints, as if Christ had acquired for us the liberty to sin. [This was the doctrine of Simon Magus and his followers.—M.] A promise similar to Gen. iii. 5; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 16; they use liberty as a cloak of maliciousness, cf. Gal. v. 13.

Slaves of corruption, ch. i. 4; ii. 12, of those sins and vices which end in perdition.—Ηττηται, by whom a man is permanently overcome, of him he has also become the slave, cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 9. He cites martial law; by whom a man is overcome in war, by him also is he enslaved. Those persons are brought by Satan into the slavery of sin and death, cf. Jno. viii. 34; 1 Jno. iii. 8; Rom. vi. 16.

Ver. 20. **For having escaped the pollutions of the world**, etc.—The question is, which is the subject of this verse? Huther thinks that we must understand the false teachers, because of the connection of this verse with the clause at the end of the preceding verse. Then the γάρ would refer back to the φθορα of v. 19. But the hypothetical form of this verse is against Huther, whereas the false teachers are introduced before as very decided persons, although it may be said that the reality is here expressed hypothetically, as is so often the case. But since ὄντως ἀποφυγόντας (v. 18) belongs to the deceived, it is better to apply ἀποφυγόντες here with Bengel, and al. to the same persons. But then we have to supply before v. 20, the sentence: "As the false teachers are themselves slaves of corruption, so they make those whom they deceive slaves of corruption: for—." Μιάσματα occurs here only in the New Testament, but μιασμός, v. 10, stain, pollution. The reference to noxious particles floating in the air, called by physicians miasma, is out of the question here, for the word was not used in this sense at the time the Epistle was written, although, as Gerhard shows, those exhalations are an apt figure of sin.—'Εν ἐπιγνώσει, cf. ch. i. 2. 3. 8; iii. 18. Here also it denotes vital knowledge.—'Εμπλακέντες. Gerhard: "This word is very emphatic; it describes those who become entangled with snares and ropes; 2 Tim. ii. 4 it is used of those who are so entangled with the affairs of this life, that they are unable to please Him any longer whom they stand pledged to serve. The LXX. use it for נָפַל to fall, Prov. xxviii. 18, from animals which fall, if they become entangled in snares and traps."—'Ηττῶνται, they return again into the slavery of sin and Satan, from which they had been delivered.

Their last state is worse than the first, appears to have been a proverbial mode of speech, cf. Luke ix. 26; Matt. xii. 45; xxvii. 64. *Grotius* cites a passage in *Hermas*, ch. iii. 2, which evidently has respect to this place: "*Quidam tamen ex iis maculaverunt se et projecti sunt de genere justorum et iterum redierunt ad statum pristinum, atque etiam deteriores quam prius evaserunt.*"—τὰ πρῶτα is the condition anterior to their conversion; τὰ ἔσχατα, the state of entire captivity in sin and its corruption. The reason being, that as there is no standing still in the way of a secure sinner, the power of sin, and with it also the guilt and punishment, have become so much the greater.

Ver. 21. **For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness.**—Γὰρ does not introduce the proof, but the explanation and confirmation of the preceding proposition. It were better for them if they had no such great guilt. Chrysostom: "Do not sin after forgiveness, suffer thyself not to be wounded after thy healing, nor to be stained after grace. Think, O man, that guilt is greater after forgiveness, that the renewed wound is more painful after healing, and that the stain is more troublesome after grace. He therefore is ungrateful for forgiveness who sins again; he is unworthy of health who wounds himself anew, and he deserves not to be cleansed who stains himself after grace."—'Ην, Imperf. Ind. where we use the Conjunctive (cf. Winer, p. 327.) [Translate: "For it were better," etc.—M.]—'Οδὸν δικαιοσύνης. Gerhard: "The doctrine of Christ, of the Gospel, which points out the way how to acquire righteousness before God and eternal life." Cf. v. 2.

Than having known it, to turn back, etc.—ἐπιγνοῦσιν. Supply ἐστι or ἦν. a well known attraction.—ἐπιστρέψαι to turn to something and return, cf. Mark xiii. 16; Luke viii. 55; Acts iii. 19. Huther considers ὑποστρέψαι the true reading; de Wette prefers the former.

From the holy commandment.—'Εντολῆς, that part of the fore-mentioned way of righteousness which comprises the doctrine of morals, and especially the cardinal commandment of love, John xiii. 34; xv. 12; 1 John iii. 23. But it may also denote the whole of the doctrines of Christ, as a commandment that must be believed and practised, as we have it in John xii. 49; xv. 10. It is called holy on account of its origin, substance and end, on account of its contrast to the pollutions of the world, and because it is the means of man's holiness.

Delivered to them, cf. Jude 3.

Ver. 22. **But it is happened to them that saying of the true proverb.**—Their relapse into their old sinfulness is elucidated by two similes taken from the animal world, with reference to v. 12.—Συμβέβηκε δέ. The truth of that proverb has been fulfilled in them, cf. Matt. vii. 6.—Παροιμία (from οἶμος, way) a proverb, wisdom by the way, in the street.—Κύων, the first proverb with a slight variation is taken from Prov.

xxvi. 11. The Participle must not be changed into its finite verb, but δεικτικῶς should be taken as referring to a case really under observation, see Winer, p. 369.

The dog, etc.—Ἐξέραμα from ἐξεράω, to throw out, to vomit.—Εἰς, supply ἐπιστρέψασα.—Κύλισμα, something rolled, and=κυλινδήθρα, a place for horses to roll in, the place of wallowing.—Βόρβορος, dirt, filth, mire. The second proverb is not found among Solomon's; it seems to be taken from popular tradition, although parallels are by no means wanting. Grotius produces several from Aratus and Philo. Similar passages are found in the Rabbinical writings. Augustine adds: "See how terrible is that to which he compares them; for it is a terrible thing: a dog, etc.—What wilt thou be in the sight of God?"

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Luther and other evangelical teachers show that the prophecy of Peter met its fulfilment not only in the first age of the Church, but especially in the papacy. Gerhard, *e. g.*, mentions the written words of Ulric, bishop of Augsburg, about A.D. 800: "Popes, bishops and clergymen rush so passionately into voluptuousness, that they perpetrate the most horrible and unnatural vices." Sixtus IV., says Gerhard, was a Sodomite, and granted leave to cardinals with whom he was on terms of intimacy, to indulge this vice during three summer-months. Paulus Jovinus affirms the same atrocity on the part of Leo X. Consult, for the fulfilment of the other marks of false teachers, Gerhard and Calov on the respective passages.

2. Augustine specifies four kinds of destruction or death. The first death is the death of the soul, if through sinning it becomes separated from God, who is the life of the soul, as the soul is the life of the body. The second death is that of the body, when it becomes separated from the soul. The third is the second death of the soul, when, in a state of separation from God and the body, it endures punishment. The fourth and last death is the death of the whole man, when the soul, without God, but with the body, will have to suffer eternal punishment.

3. As Christ has His forerunners and types, so has antichrist his. To these belong Balaam in particular. "The souls of oracular personages, prophets, magicians and enchanters like Balaam resemble the strings of a lute, which vibrate in unison with kindred notes, and reëcho them. The true prophets who were in sympathy with God, caught those notes of sympathy from above, but the false and devilish prophets caught them from beneath (Ex. vii. 11); those like Balaam caught them from both directions without being able to identify them until their heart inclined more to one or the other." Richter, *Hausbibel.*—The history and character of Balaam affords us important insight into the nature of prophecy.

4. Spiritual and carnal adultery, says Gerhard, go mostly hand-in-hand. The devil is a liar and an unclean spirit, John viii. 44; Luke xi. 24, and hence incites those whom he holds captive in his bonds to the propagation of lies and impure lusts. Those strong spirits of the post-Apostolic age, who began to stir in the time of Peter, and whose rise he foresaw, were wont to indulge in such swelling words: "Only a small standing pool can be polluted by unclean things that are poured into it, not so the ocean, which receives every thing, because it is conscious of its greatness; so little men are overpowered by meats; but he that is an ocean in power (ἐξουσία) receives every thing without being polluted thereby." So says Porphyry. See Neander. "We must," (Clement of Alexandria reports them to have said) "fight lust in the enjoyment of lust, for it is no great thing to abstain from lust if it has not been tasted, but it is a great thing to indulge lust without being overcome by it." Those false teachers have met their brethren in the restorers of the flesh and the Latter Day Saints. What sophisms and powerful errors may not be brought forth in the last days of the Church!

5. What we read here of extreme darkness, is by no means in conflict with those passages which speak of fiery flames and the lake of fire; for as intense heat and intense cold prevail in different localities here on earth at one and the same time, so the Scripture informs us that there are very different localities in the wide extent of the lower world.

6. If those who have truly escaped from the pollutions of the world, may again be entangled therein, then Holy Scripture teaches that relapsing from the state of grace is possible,—a doctrine denied by the Calvinistic School on untenable grounds.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The great folly of preferring momentary pleasure to eternal happiness. Salvation may be gained or lost in one moment of time.—"Sin is fruitful: it does not end where it begins; the sin that succeeds another is usually the punishment of that which precedes it, and that which precedes, mostly the cause of that which follows." Gerhard.—An unfortified mind opens the gate and the door to false teachers.—Stability of mind is a precious jewel.—Wicked men who fan the sparks of carnal lust in others, are able by means of such inflaming to do with them what they please.—"As soon as the heart is removed from trust in God, from glorying in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, so soon all seductions have again free entrance into the same. At first men resist for awhile, but by and by their courage flags and they are overcome at last." Rieger.—The most wretched slavery is the service of sin, for sin is the greatest tyrant.—"Those who lead a disgraceful and a vicious life, are threatened not simply with transient punishment in fire." Augustine.—The great danger of relapse: 1. The greater the measure of grace received, the greater the punishment, Heb. vi. 4–6; x. 26. 27. 2. Conversion is increasingly difficult in the case of those who have fallen from grace, just as a disease is more difficult to cure on its return than at its first occurrence.—How does relapse take place? It is usually not sudden, but gradual. Remissness in watching and prayer, indifference to the punishment of the Spirit are its precursors. The company of pious Christians is

exchanged for that of vain worldlings; the reading of entertaining books is substituted for the study of the wholesome word of God, and Christian liberty is enlarged to its utmost limits. If, to crown the whole, deceivers step in, the relapse is completed.—A relapsed person is more dangerous to others, "because knowing Christianity, he is able to hurt it more seriously by cunning than another who never knew it." Roos.

STARKE:—The deceits of sin and Satan degrade many men not only to the level of brutes, but in many points below it. O hateful monsters, ye fare worse than dumb brutes, Is. i. 3.—VER. 18. Excellent portraiture of Romish false teachers! but the evangelical Church, alas, is not free from such shameful blemishes. O Lord, heal this great hurt, Ps. xii. 2.—The wicked, as he seeks rest in sin of every kind, seeks it also in debauchery, but does not find it, although he fancies to find it forthwith, fresh lusts evermore disquiet him again and urge him to sin, so that he is a veritable slave of sin.—Every human heart is sinful, but if it is thoroughly trained and practised in sin, it is altogether imbedded in corruption and nigh to the curse. O accursed man, tremble and pray without ceasing: "O God, create in me a pure heart," and exercise thyself hereafter in godliness, 1 Tim. iv. 7. He that is devoted to covetousness, has already departed from the right way, 1 Tim. vi. 10; Lke. xii. 15.—Wilt thou and canst thou compel God to prevent thy wickedness by miracles? If thou wilt not suffer His word to deter thee from evil, He will allow it, but, look, what He will do, Lke. xvi. 30. 31.—Many words, little power! Falsehood-mongers are deceivers. The reverse is equally true. Happy the cities and countries which have teachers after the pattern of Paul, 2 Cor. ii. 17; iv. 2.—None wants to be a servant, none a slave of the fiend, but all sinners are the slaves of their lusts, of their belly, of their flesh and of the worst enemy of their temporal and eternal happiness, Jno. viii. 34.—Mark the deceit of the devil and of sin; they show thee not fire and sword, the gallows and the wheel, but portray only that which pleases and attracts; yet if thou sufferest thyself to be entangled and caught, all those things will follow, and damnation at the last, Heb. iii. 18. Fearful to hear, but true; relapses are dangerous and finally incurable, Heb. x. 26. 27.—Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall, 1 Cor. x. 12.—O man, thou makest so much of outward cleanliness in dress, in ornament and beautifying, but in the natural state of thy soul thou art like unclean dogs and sows. Remember that in proportion as thy soul is more noble than thy body, so shouldest thou the rather provide for her cleansing and beautifying.

LISCO:—The fearful relapse into sin.—The fearful end of the enemies of the Kingdom.

[VER. 12. DWIGHT: *Punishment of the Wicked, its Nature.* Theol. V., 470.

VER. 5. LIGHTFOOT: *The Way of Balaam.* Works, VII., 78.

VER. 19. BLAIR, H.: *On the Slavery of Vice.* Serm. IV., 201.

COLLYER, W. B.: *Christianity compared with Deism.* On Scripture Comparison.

VER. 20. SMALRIDGE, BP.: *The Danger of Relapsing.* Sermons, 547.

VV. 20. 21. SIMEON, C.: *Apostates in a Worse State than Ever.* Works, XX., 383.

THOLUCK, A.: *Light from the Cross,* p. 41. —M.]

CHAPTER III. 1–9.

ANALYSIS:—Reference to the long-predicted rise of scoffers, and refutation of their unbelief.

1 This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in *both* which I stir up your
2 pure minds by way of remembrance: That ye may be mindful of the words which
were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us[1] the apostles
3 of the Lord and Saviour: Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days[2]
4 scoffers,[3] walking after[4] their own lusts, And saying, Where is the promise of his coming?
for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as *they were*[5] from the
5 beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word
of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the
6 water:[6] Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished:
7 But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word[7] are kept in store,
8 reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But,
beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day *is* with[8] the Lord as a thousand
9 years, and a thousand years as one day.[9] The[10] Lord is not slack concerning his promise,
as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward,[11] not willing that
any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.

Verse 1. [German: "This Epistle, beloved, I now write you as the second in order to rouse in it [as also in the former] your pure mind by way of remembrance".—M.]

Verse 2. [1 Lachmann and Tischendorf read ὑμῶν. According to the testimony of most of the authorities this must be considered the original reading. [ἡμῶν, Rec. Oec.; ὑμῶν A. B. C. K. L., Cod. Sin.—M.]

Translate: That ye should remember the words spoken before by the holy prophets and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour *given* by your Apostles. Alford. . . . . and the commandment of the Apostles of their Lord and Saviour. Wordsworth. Fronmüller agrees with Alford in the construction but, retaining ἡμῶν, renders: . . . . and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour, given to you by us the Apostles.— As the authorities are overwhelmingly against ἡμῶν, Alford's rendering is the most correct and grammatical.— The construction is difficult, but the sense is clear and ὑμῶν so far from affecting the genuineness of the Epistle, is an evidence for its genuineness. A forger would certainly have used ἡμῶν, but a real Apostle may content himself with modestly saying ὑμῶν.—M.]

Verse 3. 2 Lachmann and Tischendorf read ἐσχάτων. [ἐσχάτου Rec. K. L. ἐσχάτων. A. B. C*., Cod. Sin., Vulg., Copt., al., Alf., Words.—M.]

[German: "at the end of the days." Translate: "in the last of the days."—M.]

[3 Omit ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ, Rec., K. L., insert A. B. C., Vulg., Copt., Syr., al.—M.] Griesb., Lachm., Tischend., ἐμπαιγμονῇ another ἅπαξ λεγόμ. [Scholz., Alf., Wordsw.—M.]

[4 Translate: Scoffers in scoffing, or (mockers in mockery.) Lillie.—M.] [αὐτῶν before ἐπιθυμίας Rec., A., al., Oec.—M.] αὐτῶν after ἐπιθυμίας [B. C. K. L.] Griesbach. [Alford.]

Verse 4. [5 German: . . . . all things remain thus from the beginning of the creation. Better than "continue as *they were* from," etc., in E. V.—M.]

Verse 5. [6 German: For it is hidden to them, because they thus will it, that the heavens and an earth were from of old out of water and by means of water consisting by the word of God.

Translate: For this escapes them of their own will, that the heavens were from of old, and the earth out of water and by means of water consisting by the word of God.—M.]

Verse 7. 7 Lachmann reads τῷ αὐτῷ, by the same word, as in v. 6. But Tischendorf with B. C. K. L. reads τῷ αὐτοῦ.

[Translate with German: "by His word." With this single, but important variation, the E. V. cannot be improved here.]

Verse 8. [8 παρὰ κυρίου. Cod. Sin.—M.]

[9 German: But let not this one thing be hidden to you, beloved, that one day is before the Lord as a thousand years, etc.

Translate: But let this one thing not escape you, (with allusion to v. 5), beloved, that one day, etc.—M.]

Verse 9. [10 Insert ὁ before κύριος, Rec., K. L., al.; omit A. B. C., Cod. Sin.] Lachm. and Tischendorf.

11 Lachmann reads δι' ὑμᾶς, for your, the believers', sake; but Tischend., with many authorities gives εἰς ὑμᾶς. [Cod. Sin. δι' ὑμᾶς.—M.]

[German: The Lord delayeth not with the promise, as some consider it a delay, but He hath patience with us, not willing that some should perish, but that all should turn to repentance.

Translate: The Lord is not tardy concerning His promise, as some account tardiness, but He is longsuffering towards us, etc. Alford.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. **This Epistle now, beloved, the second.**—The flow of fiery, prophetical diction beginning with ch. i. 16, comes here to a point of rest. Peter takes up ch. i. 15.—Ἤδη in the acceptation of *already*, gives no good sense. [But this is doubtful: we have only to render "this Epistle, already a second" and the idea is plain that this Epistle was written very soon after the former; this is the opinion of Bengel, "*priorem paullo ante scripserat;*" cf. the same author on ch. i. 12, "*alteram hanc epistolam scribit brevi intervallo post primam.*"—M.] Connect ἤδη with γράφω not with δευτέραν. Now in the near prospect of death and in the presence of scoffers denying the coming of Christ, write I unto you. This passage defines more explicitly the somewhat indefinite statement of ch. i. 15; but this does not therefore exclude a reference to the Gospel according to St. Mark.

In both which I rouse, etc.—Ἐν αἷς, the pronoun is in the Plural, because δύο is implied in δευτέραν, Winer, p. 154.—Διεγείρω, it seems, must be taken as a Conjunctive for ἵνα ἐν αὐταῖς. On the sense see ch. i. 13.—Ὑμῶν may be connected with ὑπομνήσει or διάνοιαν; the latter seems preferable.—Εἰλικρινῆ, see Phil. i. 10 from εἵλη (sun-light) and κρίνω, something attentively examined in the light of the sun and found genuine, hence pure, clear, unmixed, [unadulterated.—M.] Διάνοια, 1 Pet. i. 13, "this pure mind is at once opposed to errors in doctrine and to excuses for the practice of vices. A man of a pure mind believes and loves the truth, and grows holy in the truth." Roos. Such a mind can only be roused in the case of those, who are not in the truth, cf. Jno. xviii. 37; iii. 21; 1 Jno. i. 6. A principal means thereto is the remembrance of the revelations of God, deposited in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles.

Ver 2. **That ye should remember the words**, etc.—Here, as in 1 Pet. i. 10–12 and 2 Pet. i. 19, great weight is attached to the word of prophecy, which is brought into most intimate connection with the Apostolical doctrines.—Ἁγίων προφητῶν, see ch. i. 21.—Ἐντολῆς, ch. ii. 21.—Ἡμῶν in apposition with ἀποστόλων as in Acts x. 41. The author here repeatedly describes himself (as in ch. i. 1) as an Apostle, just as he describes himself in ch. iii. 1 as the Author of the first Epistle.—Μνησθῆναι, further definition of ἐν ὑπομνήσει. The Infinite of intention or of further definition, Winer p. 341.—Τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος; de Wette makes these words to be governed by the Infinitive and gives the ungrammatical rendering "*of our Apostles.*" But it is more natural to connect τοῦ κυρίου with ἐντολῆς. This has a double Genitive; cf. Winer, pt. iii. 30. The one of these Genitives relates to the announcement, the other to the origin of the doctrine.—In the parallel passage, Jude 17, the reference to the Prophets is omitted.—De Wette's interpretation being manifestly incorrect, we need not stop to refute his inference that the non-apostolical author here betrays himself and acts out of his character.

Ver. 3. **Knowing this first that in the last of the days scoffers shall come.**—2 Tim. iii. 1; cf. 1 Tim. iv. 1. They are to consider it as a principal point of the prophetical and apostolical word that—γινώσκοντες. Here we should expect the Accusative, governed by μνησθῆναι. Such, probably intentional, anacolutha are of frequent occurrence. Conceptions expressed by the *casus recti* of Participles, are exhibited with greater prominence, Winer, p. 594; cf. Acts xv. 23; Eph. iv. 2; iii. 17.

Shall come, cf. ch. ii. 1; Mtt. xxiv. 5. 11. 24; vii. 15. 22; 1 Jno. iv. 1. The parallel passage Jude 18 is almost identical; *ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται, κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι*, with the addition *τῶν ἀσεβειῶν*.—*Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν*. The Adjective Neuter is often used emphatically instead of the Substantive. Winer, p. 248. At the end of these present days of the world. [But as *ἐσχατῶν* is the best supported reading, cf. App. Crit., it is better to translate "in the last of the days"; there is perhaps no difference in meaning, but the Plural seems to extend the expression over a wider space, so Alford; Wordsworth: "From this reference, it appears that St. Jude wrote his Epistle *after* the present Epistle, and that he owned this Epistle to be the work of an *Apostle*, and therefore an *authentic* writing; and if authentic, then it must be also *genuine*, for it asserts itself to be written *by St. Peter*, ch. i. 1 and i. 17, where the writer describes himself as present at the transfiguration, at which only three Apostles were present, viz.: Peter, James and John."—M.]—*Ἐμπαῖκται* (from *ἐμπαίζω* to play, sport in or on) scoffers, deceivers; cf. LXX. in Is. iii. 4, for תַּעֲלוּלִים, *petulantiæ, petulantes*, people that jest about things of the greatest importance. Here we encounter another class of adversaries of Christ, different from the false prophets and teachers described in the second chapter. The two classes have this in common, that they are Epicurean and Antinomian in mind, cf. v. 17; ch. ii. 18. 19. The appearance of such men is predicted Acts xx. 29; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 2, etc. If the reading *ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ* is retained, it is necessary to use a mark of distinction after the latter word, rendering: "they shall come in the spirit of scoffing, as scoffers, walking, etc." ["They will not only *be* scoffers, but they will come *in* scoffing, like those of whom the Psalmist says, that their delight is *in cursing*, and that they *clothe* themselves with it, as it were, with *a raiment* (Ps. cix. 16. 17); and the contrast is striking to the Divine words *εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω*, Gen. xxii. 17, cf. Eph. i. 3, *ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ*, and Clem. Rom. i. 24." Wordsworth.—M.]

Walking after their own lusts.—They no longer appear in sheep's clothing, but exhibit their wolf-nature.—*Κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας αὐτων*. *Ἰδίας* brings out the self-will and opposition of these men to the law of God.—*Ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμεναι*. Bengel: "This is the origin of error, the root of libertinism." Luther: "These are our Epicureans and Sadducees, who believe neither one thing nor the other, who live as they think best and walk after their own lusts, considering permitted whatever suits their pleasure: examples of such are met on every hand."—*Πορευόμενοι*, see 1 Peter iv. 3.

Ver. 4. **Where is the promise of His coming?**—Similar to the daring words of the scoffers in Mal. ii. 17: "Where is the God of judgment?" The same form of speech occurs in Luke viii. 25; Ps. xlii. 4; lxxix. 10. Where is it? *e. g.*, Where is its fulfilment? It is nowhere to be found.

The promise.—They use the language of believers, to whom the coming of their Lord is the most cherished desire, cf. Luke xxi. 28.

Of His coming.—*παρουσίας*. Used here in a more special sense than in ch. i. 16, of the visible coming of Christ to the judgment of the wicked and to the consummation of His Kingdom, Matt. xxiv. 3. 27. 37; 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13; 2 Peter iii. 12.—*Αὐτοῦ*, they do not take His name on their lips, so much do they disdain it. [Polycarp, c. 7: "Whosoever does not confess the suffering of the cross, is of the devil; and whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and says that there is neither *resurrection nor a judgment*,—he is the first-born of Satan."—M.]

For since the fathers fell asleep.—*Ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ scil. ἡμέρας*. De Wette is wrong in saying: "The author appears to assume these scoffers as present and that prediction as fulfilled." No; this appearance springs solely from critical prejudices. Peter puts himself into the time of the fulfilment of that prediction, when the first generation of believers had already fallen asleep; most of them had expected the visible coming of the Lord as immediately connected with the destruction of Jerusalem; but after that catastrophe had taken place without the expected visible coming of the Lord, the scoffers took occasion to deny the coming of the Lord altogether. This Peter foresees in the Spirit. The word *fathers* denotes therefore not the Patriarchs, the ancestors of the Jewish people, nor (as Dietlein maintains) any preceding generation standing to that immediately succeeding it in the relation of fathers, but the fathers of the second generation of Christians. Otherwise the sentence would be pleonastic, because *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* follows after.—*Ἐκοιμήθησαν* like *ἐπαγγελία*, to be understood in a mocking sense, as imitating the language of believers.

All things remain thus from the beginning of the creation.—*Διαμένει*, they remain without intermission, the whole world remains according to its old constitution, in the consistence which it has once for all, it remains through all mutations. Huther arbitrarily inserts the idea, "since the fathers . . . . *hath come to pass*; all things continue thus . . . ."—Others supply *ὡς ἦν*, as it was from the beginning of creation, which is equally arbitrary. The construction is pregnant: "All things from the time of our fathers remain in a general way, as they are; yea, from the beginning of creation all things remain essentially the same." Bengel gives to *οὕτω* a pregnant force: "All things remain thus as they remain from the beginning of the world." [*Sic permanent, ut permanent.*"—M.] Dietlein makes these erring spirits speculative philosophers who advance the proposition that "the history of creation is endless; the destiny of the human race is not one that actually occurs at a given time and terminates the course of the world, but it fulfils itself in an untemporal (*unzeitlich*) manner (it is *immanent*, to use the language of modern speculation); and this they infer from the circumstance, that one generation passes away after another, and is dispatched as they suppose, and that therefore it cannot be otherwise with all succeeding generations." There is no reason to assume such a system in the case of these trifling Epicureans, and *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* is absolutely in conflict

with such an assumption.—Luther explains the inference of the false teachers as follows: "The world has stood so long, and has always remained thus; should it now at last become otherwise?" We must however add in the sense of those scoffers: The coming of Christ and the destruction of the world were long since predicted as connected with the destruction of Jerusalem without coming to pass; where then is now the word of the Scripture?

VER. 5. **For it is hidden to them, because they thus will it.**—Refutation of the assertion that all things remain in the same condition by the fact of the flood.—Τοῦτο belongs to ὅτι, not to θέλοντας, as in ch. iii. 8, and θέλειν denotes not "to choose a view" (*eine Ansicht belieben*, as Dietlein maintains), for this meaning cannot be verified. Huther, indeed, cites a passage from Herodotus, but it is isolated and proves nothing for the New Testament. It denotes "a guilty ignorance," as Luther translates; they are wilfully ignorant of it; they are wilfully blind to the consideration of the flood. Winer, p. 489, note [says: In 2 Peter iii. 5, λανθάνει τοῦτο θέλοντας I prefer the rendering: *latet eos hoc* (what follows) *volentes, i. e., volentes ignorant*, to the other: *latet eos* (what follows) *hoc* (what precedes) *volentes, i. e., contendentes*. The former brings out more clearly the guilt of the mockers. Neither in Col. ii. 18, is θέλων to be taken as an adverb.—M.]

That the heavens and an earth were from of old, etc.—Οὐρανοί, as usual in the Plural like שָׁמַיִם, cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2.—Ἔκπαλαι, from of old, from the first origin of all things.—Ἦσαν, de Wette, Huther, al., refer it primarily to οὐρανοί, but then also to γῆ συνεστῶσα. This might pass grammatically (Winer, p. 368), but how are we to conceive the heavens to consist out of and through water? De Wette, indeed, observes that the conception that the heavens (the firmament) were made out of water, may be justified by Gen. i. 6, but he is conscious of the unsatisfactoriness of this exposition, since he proposes to refer ἐκ to the earth and διά to the heavens (through the water). This is very forced, and in no event applicable to the starry heavens, which are of course included in οὐρανοί. According to the representation of the Bible, the firmament (רָקִיעַ) consists not out of water, but forms a wall of partition between the waters above and the waters below, Gen. i. 7. 8.—The earth originated out of water, out of the dark matter in which it was comprehended, and through water, *i. e.*, (as Winer, p. 438, explains it) through the agency of water, which partly descended into the lower parts of the earth, and partly formed the clouds in the sky. The earth, moreover, manifoldly received its diversified form through the water, consists in a great measure in water and this element, as already noticed by Oecumenius, holds it together and cements it.—The Indo-Ægyptian cosmogonies, to which de Wette refers, and which are said to contain an account of a chemical origin of the world out of water, are altogether irrelevant. [Bengel: "*Gradatio, aqua terram texerat:* EX *aquis terra emersit: et aqua* INSERVIIT, *ut terra consisteret, sicut Creator eam formavit et collocavit. Aqua ceteroqui levior est, et terra inferiores partes petit, usque eo, ut omnis aqua, in linea recta a superficie ad centrum orbis hujus sive rotundi systematis, terram semper sub se habeat: sed in ipsa superficie terra passim supra aquas plus minusve eminet; et vel hunc aqua locum quasi invita, et potentissimo jussu divino coacta, terræ concessit et reliquit.* Ex. xx. 4; Ps. xxiv. 2; civ. 5–8; cxxxvi. 6; Job xxxviii. 10."—The assertion that the earth arose out of the *water* is opposed to the dogma of *Simon Magus*, that it was engendered from *fire*. Wordsworth referring to Hippolyt., *Refut. haer*, p. 165.—M.]

By the word of God may refer both to the heavens and to the earth, cf. Gen. i. 6. 9. But we may also join these words more intimately with συνεστῶσα, which appears to be preferable, as it gives greater prominence to the thought, that it does not consist a moment longer than God permits. Bengel: "By the word of God is defined the duration of all things, so that it cannot be longer or shorter." [The reference here is to the creative energy of the Divine *Logos*. The Jewish readers of Peter's Epistle were familiar with that doctrine, which was opposed to the error of the Gnostics who held that the universe was made by angels or by the *demiurge* opposed to the supreme God. Irenæus I., 19, declares, that the world was not made by angels, nor by any powers separated from God, but by His Word, *i. e.*, Christ. Ps. xxxii. 6; John i. 8. The same author says, II., 2: "All things which God made, He made by the indefatigable *Word*, even as John the disciple of the Lord declares concerning Him, John i. 3."—M.]

VER. 6. **Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished.**—Δι' ὧν cannot possibly refer to ὕδατος (Huther), more especially because ὕδατι follows after; nor can it signify: *quapropter*, nor "through which circumstances it also came to pass that . . . ." (Dietlein), still less "yet" (*dennoch*—Luther). It evidently belongs to οὐρανοὶ καὶ γῆ. It was just the heavens and the earth which became the instruments of destruction of the then κόσμος, *i. e.*, for the then existing world of human beings and animals. Peter uses κόσμος in precisely the same sense, ch. ii. 5. The heavens became such an instrument of destruction, when their windows were opened and it rained as never before since the creation of the world, Gen. vii. 11. The earth which had been founded upon the waters and risen out of the water, Ps. xxiv. 2, in obedience to the command of God was compelled to pour forth its treasures of water, Gen. viii. 2, in order to destroy man and beast. Who would have believed this before the flood came? Who would have supposed that the heavens and earth did contain within them such powers of destruction, seeing that they consisted so long before? Every attempt of taking κόσμος in another sense, understanding it of the whole world, of the universe (Huther, al.), or more particularly of the earth (Calov), fails to bring out the full force of ἀπώλετο, which was then to be circumscribed to such an extent as to denote a great mutation, which conflicts with grammatical usage. But here we must take a retrospective view of ἔκπαλαι, v. 5, in order to understand the full refutation of the antagonistic proposition. 1. Ἔκπαλαι should

be joined not only with οὐρανοί, but also with γῆ. The heavens and the earth even in the time of Noah had consisted from of old, upwards of 1600 years; from this circumstance the men of that time might have drawn the inference that all things in the world of man would ever remain, even as they were; but how fallacious was that inference! 2. With this is connected the thought, that considering that the earth came into existence and does consist by the Word of God, the people of that time might surely have been able to understand that it could be destroyed by the self-same Word. 3. The event has shown, that the world of man was destroyed just by the heavens and the earth, which to them had the appearance of an imperishable existence. 4. Now the heavens and the earth, as intimated in v. 7, underwent also a change in that catastrophe. That flood which covered the whole earth would be inexplicable without an extraordinary influence exerted by God upon the heavens and the earth, whereby their condition was changed. Gen. ix. 11, cf. x. 25, where reference is made to an extraordinary terrestrial catastrophe, expressly testify that the earth was destroyed by the flood, and that it presented in many respects an appearance very different from that which it had before that mighty revolution.

Ver. 7. **But the heavens and the earth which are now, by His word are kept in store.**—*Οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοί.* Νῦν belongs also to γῆ and presupposes a change wrought upon the heavens and the earth by the flood; according to our exposition, it is not in antithesis with ὁ τότε κόσμος.—Τῷ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ. The same Divine omnipotence which commanded the water to destroy men and to lay waste the earth, will hereafter destroy the present world by fire, and not only change the surface of the earth. [Irenæus calls the last conflagration, "*diluvium ignis.*" Bengel: "*Ignis confutabit empæctas.*"—M.]

Kept in store.—θησαυρίζειν, properly, to lay up in store, to treasure up, *e. g.*, grain or a treasure. The meaning is not, that the present world is only a treasure gathered together and saved from the deluge, merely a remnant of the original world-totality. Such an idea belongs not to θησαυρός. But the reference is doubtless partly to the promise (Gen. ix. 15), and partly to the redemption in Christ. Calov:—"The world, for a certain time, is as yet in store and left unhurt, like treasure stored up in a chest, as yet untouched." Huther justly rejects Dietlein's notion that the idea of profit must be held fast, in the sense that the heavens and the earth are the materials stored up for the exercise of punishment, yet so that they shall perish under the punishment.

Reserved unto fire, etc.—Πυρὶ must not be connected with τεθησαυρισμένοι, but with τηρούμενοι. Just as fire is even now an instrument of punishment to the world, so it will be used as an instrument of the destruction of the world in the final judgment, cf. Gen. xix. 24; Amos vii. 4; Is. lxvi. 15; Dan. vii. 9; 2 Thess. i. 8; Matt. iii. 12; xxv. 41; Rev. xix. 20; xx. 10. This is enlarged upon in v. 10.—Τηρούμενοι, used several times by Peter, 1 Pet. i. 4; 2 Pet. ii. 4. 9. 17.—Ἀπωλείας.—Calov:—"Not perfect destruction, but perdition and eternal death."—Τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων.—Dietlein applies this to the whole human race, because with the exception of the converted, it is ungodly. [But he is here, as so often, inaccurate and unreliable. The reference is simply to the ungodly *among* men. The following passage from an oration by Melito, Bp. of Sardis, in the second century, published from the Syriac by Cureton, is an interesting relic of ancient exegesis: "There was a flood of water, and all men and living creatures were destroyed by the multitude of waters, and the just were preserved in an ark of wood by the ordinance of God. So also it will be at the last time; there will be a *flood of fire*, and the earth will be burnt up, together with its mountains, and men will be burnt up with the idols which they have made; and the sea together with the isles will be burnt, and *the just shall be delivered* from the fury (of the fire), as their fellows in the ark (were saved) from the waters in the deluge."—M.]

Ver. 8. **But let this one thing not escape you,** etc.—This is not a second refutation of the scoffers, but the removal of an obstacle which believers might find in the protracted delay of Christ's advent.

That one day is before the Lord.—The shortest space of time before Him, is in His sight long enough for the execution of events, which in our computation would require a thousand years, and the longest space of time before Him passes away as rapidly as does a day to us. In order to occupy the right stand-point with respect to the coming of Christ, we must apply the standard of eternity, and not use human measures of time. The second clause of the proposition is taken from Ps. xc. 4. Time is not absolutely denied in the case of God, but His relation to time is very different from that sustained by us men, the creatures of a day. Bengel:—"God's *æonologium* (time-piece for eternity) differs from the *horologium* (time-piece for hours) of mortals. But how shall we understand this? If we could understand it, Moses and Peter would not have been under the necessity of adding "with the Lord."—Stier:—"He who created the heavens and the earth in six days, because He thus willed it, may also suddenly accomplish in one day that which under other circumstances would require a thousand years; in like manner He may ordain thousands of years to be to the world week-and-work-days before His great Sabbath begins to dawn. The longest time is only brief after God's measure; yet it hastens and rushes irresistibly into eternity, just because it is time."—Thiersch:—"The internal development of mankind, which must have reached its consummation before the end of the world, is so entirely dependent on the Divine disposal that at one time there may occur a step forward so mighty that we should hardly have expected it to take place in a thousand years, while at another time, the course of development, retarded by God, does not progress in a thousand years any further than at other times in a day." This is as incorrect as Dietlein's view, that God will punish in one day the sin of thousands of years, and thus equalize the great disfiguring which by so long a duration had come into eternity; that otherwise the duration of time with God is of great, though not of necessary, importance, be-

cause a thousand years are before Him as one day.—The Fathers, as is well known, have drawn from this passage the inference that the world is to last six thousand years, especially as Heb. iv. 9 speaks of a Sabbath-time of the people of God, but without sufficient reason.

VER. 9. **The Lord is not tardy.**—*Οὐ βραδύνει ὁ κύριος*. Βραδύνω, to delay, to postpone [to be late.—M.], usually construed with the Accusative, but here with the Genitive. See Winer, § 30.—De Wette:—*βραδύνει* is not taken in relation to a definite point of time, according to human expectation, as in 1 Tim. iii. 15, but with reference to the purpose and counsel (of God); for although with reference to the former the author admitted a delay, he denied the title to such an expectation, according to v. 8, because God's views of time (as well as His thoughts and ways, cf. Is. lv. 8) are different from men's. Similarly, Sir., 35, 22; cf. Hab. ii. 3.—Calov:—"Although it seems as though He were tardy (Rev. vi. 10), He is not tardy after the manner of men, from procrastination or neglect, but from long-suffering, for, as Justin observes, He prefers repentance to punishment."—*Κύριος*, as in v. 8, denotes God the Father.—*ὥς τινὲς βραδυτῆτα*. The reference here is not to scoffers, who deny the coming of Christ, but to weak believers.

But He is long-suffering towards us, etc. —*μακροθυμεῖ*. He is long-suffering, putting off His punishment for a long time, Matt. xviii. 26. 29; Lke. xviii. 7; 1 Thess. v. 14. *Εἰς ἡμᾶς*, towards us, the called, then to us all, to men in general. *Βούλεσθαι*, to will, as the result of conscious deliberation, but not with irresistible coercion. Calov:—"As an earthly king would desire to see all his subjects happy, as far as they are his subjects, not as far as they are malefactors."—*Χωρεῖν εἰς*, to go into, to enter, Matt. xv. 17; cf. Ezek. xviii. 23; xxxiii. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 4. —The adherents of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination wrongly restrict this passage to the elect. Calvin himself explains it of the will of God revealed in the Gospel as contrasted with His hidden counsel.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. A sure means of resisting the temptations of the last anti-Christian times and of repelling the assaults of deceivers is keeping the prophetic and apostolic word in an honest and good heart, even as Christ often exhorts us to keep His sayings against the subtle attacks of the enemy.—"In the last days there will be a thorough confluence of all the corruption engendered by former unbelief."—"He who by his lusts is corrupted in error, will do what he desires, and will not be deterred from it by any fear of God. This necessitates an unbelieving cancelling of all the truth of God, and if good proofs of such pretences are wanting, scoffing and witty humour must become the substitutes of proof." H. Rieger.

2. Peter in making mention of the last days, draws no distinction between the second and third coming of Jesus, as made prominent in the Revelation of John, and alluded to in 1 Cor. xv. 23. 24. This circumstance deserves to be noticed in connection with the inquiry relating to the date of this Epistle.

3. "The Word of God composed in writing is the instrument of our conversion and illumination, the store-house of all salutary knowledge and wisdom, and the armory against all sorts of enemies." Gerhard.

4. Although we must identify the scoffers primarily as those deceivers, who arose at the end of the Apostolic age, the prophecy, nevertheless, is ever undergoing new fulfilments in the course of time, and will have its most fearful fulfilment in the last times. In ancient times, Simon Magus is cited as denying the end of the world (in the *Pseudo-Clementine Recogn.*, v. 3); in the middle ages, a heresy sprung up, which maintained the imperishableness of the world. v. Meyer asks whether that portrait of the future does not perfectly apply to the rebellious liberty and wanton licentiousness of the corrupt priesthood and monastic orders of the middle ages and later times? "The *Hegelian* school of philosophers (at least those of the left side) deride the Church's faith in a visible advent of Christ, in the judgment and the end of the world, as a pietistic notion. They see in the dominant influence of the idea (*Begriff*), brought about by the Hegelian philosophy, Christ returned, and regard the end of pietism, of orthodox Christianity as heretofore existing, to be the end of the world." Richter.

5. "It is an old trick of the devil to oppose the course of nature to the word and promises of God, seeing that God is the Author of nature, and able at His pleasure to change or wholly destroy it." Gerhard.

6. The traditions of other nations also contain the hypothesis that the world originated out of water. The *Chinese* and the *Egyptians* teach that water is the oldest element. The *Vedas* of the *Hindoos* declare that this world was originally water; the code of *Manu* declares that water was the first thing which God created; *Ramayana* reports that originally all things were water, and that the earth was formed out of it. But this, so far from being a ground of suspicion against the teaching of Scripture, in connection with other reasons, constitutes a proof in its favour.

7. In like manner all nations have their legends of the great deluge, of which the highest mountains, the graves and caverns of the earth bear testimony. The deluge, according to Scripture, was not partial and local, but universal; but natural science, to be sure, is incompetent to account for it by natural causes.

8. The preservation of the world, as well as its beginning, depends altogether on the will, the word and the direction of God. "The word of God is not only the architect of the heavens and the earth, but also the prop and foundation of this edifice, Heb. i. 3." Gerhard.

9. The statements of Peter respecting the world being reserved unto fire, are partly connected with the sayings of Christ, Mk. ix. 44; Matt. iii. 10. 12; xxv. 41; xiii. 40. 42; vi. 22, and partly, where he goes beyond them, to be regarded as a revelation which he had received. The religions of the pagans and the philosophemes of the Greeks and Romans, frequently describe fire as the end of the world. Zoroaster

assumed a dissolution of the mountains by the action of fire. The Orphic cosmogony, Heraclitus and the Stoics, the Epicureans, Pliny, Ovid, the Gallicans and the Scandinavians coincide in this respect. The Mexicans describe the fourth age of the world, as the age of fire. The Hindoos also teach the future burning of the world. "This fact proves nothing against the truth of this doctrine. On the contrary, it can only deepen the overpowering impression of the sacred revelations of the final judgment." Dietlein.—"As men are melted and purified by the fire (of the law, the love of God and the sufferings of Christ), so it will fare with the earth which goes the course of man. In the time of Tycho de Brahe, according to the opinion of some, another solar system met perhaps a similar fate." Richter.

10. Although time was created simultaneously with the creature, it is nevertheless to God also a reality, otherwise He would not interfere with time and be conscious of what occurs in time; but He is superior to the river of time and controls it. A thousand years with Him are as one day, similar, (so Bengel puts it), as a thousand flourins are with a rich man as a farthing.

11. Even before Justin and other fathers gave currency to the opinion that the world should last six thousand years, the ancient *Etruscans* taught from tradition that the world's duration was fixed at 6000 years, that the sixth millennium would bring the end and the great year.

12. Calov rightly declares verse 9 to be an unanswerable proof against the absolute decree of Calvin, and quotes also 1 Tim. ii. 4. God wills to save all men only in Christ and in the order of repentance and faith.

[13. Bp. Conybeare on v. 5: "The truth of the case is, God does not interpose in a miraculous manner upon every instance of sin: as He hath made men free agents, so He doth not interrupt the use of this liberty by breaking in upon the common order of causes and effects. Hence nature goes on for the most part in one uniform course; and exemplary punishments are reserved only for extraordinary occasions. Yet still God hath not left Himself without witness: many predictions of His prophets have been already confirmed by fact; the old world was destroyed by a miracle, and Sodom and Gomorrah are set forth for an example, having suffered the vengeance of eternal fire." Instances of this kind, it must be confessed, are rare: however, those few which have been afforded us are enough to alarm the sinner. Men should not flatter themselves that their crimes are forgotten, because they are yet unpunished: but rather dread the delays of vengeance. Though mercy spares them for the present, yet this very mercy, if slighted, will increase their future ruin.—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The advent of Christ: 1. Its signs and certainty. 2. The particulars attending it. 3. The preparation for it.—As the coming of the Lord draws nearer, the denial and derision of it will grow stronger.—It should be our most anxious care to be ready, whether the Lord come early or late.—Why does God defer the full punishment of the ungodly to the day of judgment? 1. Because the measure of their unrighteousness is not yet wholly filled; 2. Because it is His will to accord to sinners room for repentance; 3. In order to set His long-suffering towards all men, in the clearest light; 4. In order to make more manifest the wickedness of those who will not be converted.—Let us take heed, not to abuse the long-suffering of God, but to know the time of our visitation, Lke. xix. 44.—What is the longest life in the light of eternity? A span of time of 1½ to 2 hours' duration.

Starke:—As frail men grow soon tired and are overcome of sleep, so it is with Christians; hence it is necessary that they should be constantly stirred, shaken and roused, Heb. xii. 1.—The works of our bad Christians show that they believe neither in heaven nor hell, neither in angels nor in the devil, but the truth will come home to them, Zeph. i. 12.—Only see, how deeply man can fall through the violence of his lusts; deeper than the devil himself, who denies neither God nor His judgment, but trembles at it, Mtt. viii. 29; Jas. ii. 19.—Ignorance in things human or Divine is never good, but malicious ignorance, which refuses to hear and to know the truth, is worthy of hell-fire, Is. l. 11.—The present world will be more severely visited than the former world, which was laid waste by water; but this world will be burnt up by a consuming fire, which the Lord Himself will kindle, 2 Thess. i. 7. 8.—The long-suffering of God is accompanied by tender love, looking to the salvation of men; hence He does not overtake them with His judgment of wrath, but gives them time enough to repent, Ez. xxxiii. 11; ii. 1.

V. Herberger:—1. How Peter answers five questions relating to the last day. 2. How thoroughly he instructs us as to the manner of our preparing for it. Ad 1. *a.* Whether we are yet to wait confidently for the last day? *b.* When and at what time it will come? *c.* Why Jesus has not come for so long a time? *d* and *e.* How and in what manner the last day will come? *f.* What the Lord Jesus will do and perform on the last day? Ad 2. *a.* In holy conversation and godliness, *b.* To wait and hasten unto the coming of the day of the Lord, *c.* To give all diligence that we may be found of Him without spot and blameless.

J. C. Storr:—The waiting of believers for the coming of the day of God: 1. What they wait for; 2. Who are they who wait? 3. How do they wait?

Stier:—The Apostle's word concerning the expectation of the last day: 1. The certainty of its coming; 2. The manner of its coming; 3. The preparation for it.

Kapff:—The beginning and completion of the Kingdom of God: 1. The beginning in the creation of the world and man; 2. The completion in the renovation of man and of the world.

Lisco:—The completion with which the citizens of the kingdom comfort themselves. The emptiness of the objections against the Bible-dogma of the Lord's coming to judgment.

Staudt:—The destruction of the world: 1. The reasons why many do not believe it; 2. How does the destruction of the world affect us?

SHARP:—[O what confusion will this be to all unbelievers and impenitent sinners, when they shall see that very Person, of whom they thought so meanly, and whose offers of salvation they often despised, appearing in the clouds of heaven with ten thousand glorious angels about Him, and coming in the most terrible manner that can be imagined, to call them to account for their lives past, and to execute judgment upon all ungodly men! They will not then any longer, with the scoffers, that Peter tells us should be in the last days, say, "where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation;" for they shall be convinced that, however His coming was for good reasons deferred, yet He shall then come to purpose; to the everlasting confusion of their faces, that opposed, or despised, or neglected Him and His religion. Then shall they say, Yonder He is, whom we slighted, whose religion we denied, whose servants and followers we took to be no better than a company of credulous fools! Lo, yonder He is in the clouds, whose tenders of mercy we have refused, whose counsels we have rejected, to whose Spirit we have done despite! Yonder He is: but no longer "a carpenter's son;" no longer "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" no longer a mean, obscure Galilean; no longer a crucified God, as we in derision called Him: but the everlasting Son of the everlasting Father; the Sovereign of angels! the Judge of mankind and of devils; the Lord of all things both in earth and heaven.—M.]

[Cf. JOSEPH MEDE'S *Paraphrase and Exposition of St. Peter.* 2. Epistle, ch. iii. Works, II., 758.

Additional Sermon-Themes:

VER. 8. Ridicule in matters of religion. Modern infidelity. Some prophecies are daily fulfilling.

VER. 4. Miracles now neither necessary to the conviction of unbelievers, nor the conversion of sinners, (FIDDES). Consistency between the efficacy of prayer and the uniformity of nature. (CHALMERS).

VER. 8. God's eternity in reference to the suspension of his promised purposes, (R. HALL).—M.]

CHAPTER III. 10–18.

10 But the day[1] of the Lord will come as a thief in the night,[2] in the which the[3]
heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt[4] with fervent
11 heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.[5] *Seeing* then[6]
that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner *of persons* ought ye[7] to be in *all*
12 holy conversation and godliness, Looking for and hastening[8] unto the coming of the
day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements
13 shall melt with fervent heat?[9] Nevertheless[10] we, according to his promise,[11] look
14 for new heavens and a new[12] earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in
15 peace, without spot, and blameless. And account *that* the longsuffering of our Lord
is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto
16 him[13] hath written unto you; As also in all[14] *his* epistles, speaking in them of these
things; in which[15] are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as *they do* also the other Scriptures, unto their own de-
17 struction.[16] Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know *these things* before, beware lest ye
also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness.[17]
18 But grow in grace, and *in* the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To
him *be* glory both now and forever. Amen.[18]

Verse 10. [1] ἡ omitted by Lachmann and Tisch. The Article is not wanted, because every body knows what sort of a day it is. cf. v. 7; Phil. i. 6. 10; ii. 16. [ἡ omitted in B. C.; inserted in Rec. with A. K. L., al.—M.]

[2] ἐν νυκτί omitted by Tischen. and al. [also in A. B., Sin., al., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Arm., al.; inserted in C. K. L., Rec., Syr.—M.]

[[3] Omit οἱ before οὐρανοὶ, Sin., K. L., al.—Sin. and Cod. Colbert., insert μὲν after οὐρανοὶ.—M.]

[4] Lachmann reads λυθήσεται; Tisch. with A. G. K. prefers λυθήσονται [Sin., B. C., read λυθήσεται.—M.]

[[5] Sin. B. L., al., read εὑρεθήσεται for κατακαήσεται.—M.]

[German: "As a thief in the night, in which the heavens shall pass away with a crashing roar, but the elements shall be dissolved in fire, and the earth and the works in it, shall be burned up."

Translate: "As a thief in the night, in which the heavens shall pass away with a rushing noise, but the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works in it shall be burned up."—Dr. Lillie calls attention to the onomatopoeia in ῥοιζηδόν which most versions here sought to preserve. The word *rushing*, like the German '*Geræusch*' (Stier) resembles ῥοιζηδόν most.—In λυθήσονται I have retained the Passive force with Vulg., Syr., de Wette, Alford and Lillie.—M.]

Verse 11. [6] Tisch., with B. C., and many other authorities, reads οὕτως for οὖν; [οὖν, A. K. L., Vulg., al.—M.]
[[7] ἡμᾶς, Sin.*—omits ὑμᾶς B.—M.]
[German: "Since then all these things are being dissolved, as what sort of persons ought ye to evidence yourselves in all manner of holy walk and godliness?"
Translate: "All these things being thus to be dissolved (Alford) what manner . . . . ."—M.]

Verse 12. [[8] Sin. omits καὶ σπεύδοντ; but Tisch. marks the reading with *.—M.]
[German: "Expecting and hastening (so Alford, Bloomf., de Wette, Lillie) the coming of the day of God, for the sake of which (παρουσίαν) the heavens being on fire, shall dissolve (themselves), and the elements shall melt away with fervent heat."
[9] Translate: " . . . . by reason of which (ἡμέραν understood, Alford), the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall be melted with a fervent heat (τακήσεται C. Vulg., Lachm., or retaining τήκεται as the present of destiny, render 'are to be melted.')"—M.]

Verse 13. [[10] The German *dagegen*, and *nevertheless* of E. V. objectionable on account of their strong adversative force and the emphasis they give to ἡμεῖς; better translate 'but' with most of the foreign versions, Alf., Hammond, Doddridge, Lillie.—M.]
[11] A. Lachm. read καὶ τὰ ἐπαγγελμάτα αὐτοῦ.—[Sin. τὰ ἐπεγγαλμάτα.—M.]
[[12] Insert καινὴν before γῆν A. Vulg., al.—κενήν γῆν Sin.—M.]

Verse 14. [German: "Wherefore, beloved, expecting these things, be diligent to be found spotless and blameless before Him in peace."—M.]

Verse 15. [[13] Rec. has αὐτῷ before δοθεῖσαν with L.; δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ, A. B. C. K., Sin., al.—M.]
German: "Account *your* salvation." Better in strict conformity to the Greek "And the longsuffering of our Lord account salvation——wrote unto you."—M.]

Verse 16. [[14] ταῖς before ἐπιστολαῖς omitted in A. B. C. K., al., Vulg,. Syr., Alf.—M.], Lachm. and Tisch.
[15] Lachmann reads αἷς referring to ἐπιστολαῖς; Tischend., with A. G. K. prefers the reading οἷς. So de Wette. [ἐν αἷς, A. B., Sin.—M.]
[[16] German: "As he also does in all his Epistles, speaking in them of these things, among which are some things difficult to understand, which the ignorant and unstable distort, as also the other Scriptures to their own perdition."—M.]

Verse 17. [[17] German: "Ye, therefore, beloved, knowing it before, beware, lest being led away together with the error of the lawless, ye fall from your own stedfastness."—M.]

Verse 18. [[18] German: "But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To Him be glory both now and to the day of eternity. Amen."
Translate:— . . "To Him the glory both now and to the day of eternity."—M.]

SUBSCRIPTION: πετρου B, A. B. Sin.; επιστολη πετρου α' και β' Cod. Colbert.;—του αγιου αποστολου πετρου επιστολη [δευτερα. L., al.; πετρου καθολικη. C.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 10. **But the day of the Lord will come.**—The Apostle having made mention of the long-suffering of God, now says, as it were, let none deceive himself, the day of the Lord will not fail to appear, but it will come surely and suddenly. Ἥξει δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου; it is called the day of God in v. 12; hence κυρίου is here doubtless=Θεοῦ, as in v. 9. So Joel i. 15; Ezek. xiii. 5; Isa. ii. 12. The day of Jehovah; cf. Jas. v. 7. Elsewhere the day of the Lord Jesus, 2 Cor. i. 14. The day of Christ, 2 Thess. ii. 2; also the day of the Lord's coming, Mal. iii. 2. The last expression contains an intimation that the beginning of that great period of judgment must be distinguished from the Lord's coming in the same. The former sets in unexpectedly and without notice. The Lord's coming will be unexpected, but not unnoticed by the ungodly; it will be attended by a war-cry, the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, 1 Thess. iv. 16.

As a thief in the night.—The same figure is used by the Lord Himself in the Gospels, Matt. xxiv. 43; Luke xii. 39. Paul also compares the coming of that day to the burglarious entry of a thief. The passages in Revelation, ch. iii. 3; xvi. 15, which contain this description of the Lord's coming, give prominence to the suddenness and surprise of His coming, not to its being unnoticed. His coming is free from surprise and terror to those who watch and observe the signs of the times; it is to them rather a joyful event, Luke xxi. 28.—The figure of the thief contains also the secondary thought, that those who are held fast in the sleep of sin and security, shall lose in that catastrophe whatever they have, Matt. xiii. 12; John x. 10.

In which the heavens shall pass away with a crashing roar; ῥοιζηδόν from ῥοιζέω, ῥοίζω, to rush, to whiz, to crash; a word formed to resemble the sound, rushing, whizzing, crashing, here only in the New Testament. Oecumenius understands it of the crackling noise of a destructive fire; de Wette, of the crash of falling houses. The Apostle probably thinks of both, (Huther).—Παρελεύσονται; our Lord uses the same word, Matt. xxiv. 35; cf. Ps. cii. 27; Isa. xxxiv. 4; Rev. xx. 11.—Οὐρανοί, the sky and the starry heavens, as in v. 7; cf. Ps. lxxii. 7; cii. 26; Isa. xxxiv. 4; li. 6; lxv. 17.

But the elements shall be dissolved in fire, and—shall be burned up.—Στοιχεῖα; the rudiments of speech, then the constituent elements of the universe; of course not the elements in the sense of chemistry, but in the sense of antiquity, which since the time of Empedocles assumed the existence of four elements or rudiments of things; cf. Wisd. vii. 17; xix. 17.—Calov restricts the word to water and air, because the earth is specifically mentioned afterward. But de Wette rightly observes that the earth is referred to first as an element, and afterward as a totality. There is nothing contradictory in the idea that this elemental fire shall be suspended in its action by a stronger and supernatural fire. A total annihilation of the elemental constituents is out of the question; the reference is rather to the supposition of Gennadius and Oecumenius, that "the old heavens and the old earth shall be changed and renovated into better."—A reference to v. 12, where the στοιχεῖα are mentioned, and not the earth expressly, shows plainly that στοιχεῖα relates primarily to the earth. δὲ, moreover intimates as much. Bengel, on the other hand, sees here, with many of the fathers, a reference to the sun, the moon and the stars. The sense=θεμέλια, foundations of the earth, given by others, cannot be verified. [The view of Bengel is that of Justin, Theophilus of Antioch, Polycrates, Mede, Hammond, Whitby and Alford. The last

named author, after quoting Justin, argues that δὲ followed presently by the καί when reference is made to the earth, necessarily belongs to the heavens, and that the mention of the heavenly bodies as affected by the great day is constant in Scripture, cf. Matt. xxiv. 29; Isa. xiii. 9. 10; xxiv. 23; xxxiv. 4, etc. On the other hand, the view propounded in the text is that of Wordsworth, who says that "St. Peter's meaning seems to be, that the στοιχεῖα, *elements* or *rudiments*, of which the universe is composed and compacted, will be *loosed;* that is, the frameworks of the world will be disorganized, and this is the sense of στοιχεῖα in the LXX., Wisd. vii. 17; xix. 18, and in Hyppolyt. *Philos.* pp. 219. 318. The *dissolution* is contrasted with the *consistency* described by the word συνεστῶσα in v. 5. The *heavens* are reserved for fire (v. 7) and will pass away with a *rushing noise*, and, being set on *fire, will be dissolved* (v. 12), *the elements will be on fire and melt* (v. 12), and be reduced to a state of confusion; *the earth and the works therein will be burnt up.*—There does not seem, therefore, to be any cause for abandoning the common meaning of στοιχεῖα, the *elemental* principles of which the universe is made."—M.] —Λυθήσονται. Gerhard: "When the preserving and supporting power of God, which is, as it were, the soul of the world, shall separate itself from the macrocosm, it will fall together like a soulless corpse."

The works.—To wit, the works of nature and of art [Bengel: *operæ naturæ et artis.*—M.] trees, plants, minerals, animals, cities, houses, provisions, instruments, etc., cf. Hab. ii. 13.

[**Shall be burned up.**—The variation εὑρεθήσεται of Cod. Sin. B. and K. is difficult to account for.—M.]

Ver. 11. **Since then all these things are being dissolved.**—Λυομένων, not λυθησομένων. The Apostle vividly enters into the catastrophe and mentally anticipates it according to the characteristic, which has been noticed in ch. ii. 10; iii. 8, and especially also in the first Epistle. Winer, p. 358, explains it as follows: "These things, by their nature intended to be dissolved—the destiny of dissolution is already inherent in them." Calov applies the Present to the certainty of the event. [The reading οὕτως accords with the abrupt style of Peter, and makes the scene all the more vivid.—M.]

As what sort of persons ought ye to evidence yourselves? etc.—Ποταπός or ποδαπός from τόπος or δάπεδον, land, soil, signifies properly, from what country, where born, whence in point of origin, not equivalent to ποῖος. Cf. Matt. viii. 27; Luke i. 29; vii. 39; 1 John iii. 1. It often denotes a question of surprise, to which no answer is given; but here the answer is added in v. 12. Sense: "Ye must evidence yourselves as persons of more noble origin, as citizens of the heavenly kingdom that are only strangers here on earth." This seems to be an echo of the first Epistle. The common use of ποταπός in the New Testament as connected with an exclamation, is not decisive against our interpretation. Huther wants to supply before ποταποὺς, "consider then," but this is arbitrary. De Wette takes ποταποὺς in the sense of *quantus*, how great, how strong, how diligent ought ye to be in holy conversation. But this is ungrammatical. The connection is this: Considering that this entire world-system, with whatever it contains, is doomed to perish, it becomes us Christians to tear our hearts from all inordinate love of the world, and to qualify ourselves even now as citizens of the celestial world. Augustine: "If there is an end of the world, if we have to move away from this world, we must not love the world;" and in another passage: "Seeing that Christ shall come to judgment the very day in which the world shall be dissolved, and that all must appear before His judgment-seat, let us live in the true fear of God, serve Him in holiness and righteousness, and carefully guard against sins." —Ἀναστροφαῖς. The Plural as in 1 Peter i. 15; ii. 1, to mark the different forms and directions of a holy walk and piety, cf. 2 Peter ii. 2; i. 3.

Ver. 12. **Expecting and hastening the coming of the day of God.**—Προσδοκᾶν.—Not with Luther: To wait as contrasted with haste, but looking for, expecting something while enduring the pressure of evil, cf. v. 14.—Σπεύδοντας. Some commentators arbitrarily supply εἰς; the sense of yearning or longing for cannot be verified; it signifies to urge, to press, to hasten, and applies therefore not only to earnest occupation, but, as Bengel asserts, to inward struggling, to perseverance in prayer for the hastening of the Kingdom of Christ, and to preparation for it in repentance and holiness. At the same time the remark of Richter is true, that "in a certain respect it is visionary, dangerous and passionate to pray for the hastening of the end of the world and the termination of the æon of Gospel-calling."

[Trench (*Bible Revision*, p. 112) pronounces for the marginal reading in E. V., "hasting the coming" (*accelerantes adventum*, Erasmus), and explains: The faithful, that is, shall seek to cause the day of the Lord to come the more quickly by helping to fulfil those conditions, without which it cannot come—that day being no day inexorably fixed, but one the arrival of which it is free to the Church to help and hasten on by faith and by prayer, and through a more rapid accomplishing of the number of the elect." De Wette, followed by Alford: "They hasten it by perfecting, in repentance and holiness, the work of the Gospel, and thus diminishing the need of the μακροθυμία, v. 9," to which the delay of that day is owing. Alford, in reply to Huther's objection, says, "It is true that the delay or hastening of that day is not man's matter, but God's: but it is not uncommon in Scripture, to attribute to *us* those Divine acts, or abstinences from acting, which are really and in their depth, God's own. Thus we read, that 'He could not do many mighty works there because of their unbelief,' Matt. xiii. 58, compared with Mark vi. 5. 6; thus repeatedly of man's striving with, hindering, quenching God's Holy Spirit."—Wordsworth considers this remarkable thought as compared with St. Peter's *speech* in Acts iii., as another silent evidence of the *genuineness* of this Epistle.—M.]

Τὴν παρουσίαν. See v. 10, cf. Tit. ii. 13; Rev. xvi. 14; Acts xvii. 31. The term "day of God" cannot excite surprise, if respect is had to the Old Testament. Lachmann's notion that the author had given up the hope of Christ's coming, and mixed it up with God's future day of judg-

ment, is incongruous, for he treats of the Lord's *παρουσία* in ch. iii. 4.

For the sake of which the heavens being on fire, shall dissolve (themselves), and the elements shall melt away with fervent heat; *δι' ἥν*. It is best to connect *ἥν* with *παρουσίαν*, and to take *διά* as indicating the occasioning cause. Winer, p. 418, [who sanctions however the construction recommended in Appar. Crit., which is also that adopted by Alford.—M.] Dietlein renders "in honour of which, as it were," but this rendering is inapposite. If the plan of God is to be carried out, this sin-stained world must perish. Augustine says of the succession of the events, "After the judgment the world will be on fire; that is, it will be entirely burned up." This is also thought probable by Gerhard, who holds moreover that the burning of the world will take place before the wicked are cast into hell and the godly received to heaven.

Καυσοῦσθαι and *τήκεσθαι*, to melt like wax, are *ἅπαξ λεγ*. The Present is used here for the same reason, as in v. 11, above. [The note of Wolfius, (*Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ*) on the force of these Presents will be found useful: "*Interim nihil est mutandum. Patet enim, Apostolum in duobus his commatibus, data opera, nunc præsenti λυομένων et τήκεται, nunc futuro λυθήσεται de ea re uti, quæ tam certa futura erat, ac si jam fieret.*"—M.]

Ver. 13. **But we, according to His promise, expect new heavens and a new earth.**—The Apostle, for the comfort of believers, contrasts the destruction of the present world-system with the expectation of new heavens and a new earth. This hope is founded on the word of prophecy, Isa. lxv. 17; lxvi. 22; xxx. 26; cf. Rev. xxi. 1. This does not denote an ideal state of blessedness, but a real spirituo-corporeal body-world. So Anselm: "The whole earth, which carried in its lap the body of the Lord, will be a paradise." Augustine: "The promises of God are apprehended by faith; hope cannot reach them, love cannot understand them; they surpass our longings and desires; they may be obtained, but cannot be estimated." Grotius mentions that Plato also speaks of a pure earth and a pure heavens. Calov suggests a substantial recreation of heaven. More correctly even Irenæus: "Neither the substance, nor the existence of the creature will be annihilated." *According to His promise, κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ* sc. God.

In which dwelleth righteousness.—Not *abstr. pro concreto*, the righteous, but true righteousness itself or a perfect agreement with the will of God, cf. Rev. xxi. 27. 8. This is added partly for the encouragement, partly for the consolation of believers with reference to their unrighteous oppressors. Huther produces similar passages from the *book of Enoch*, in which reference seems to be made to our Epistles. [The passages are ch. x. 27; lv. 5; liv. 4. 5; xc. 17.—Wordsworth says, that the Apostle "does not represent the heavens as destined to *destruction*, but as hereafter to be transformed (*ἀναστοιχειουμένους*) to a more *glorious condition*. As the mortal bodies of the saints are dissolved by death, and will not be reduced to annihilation, but will, by reason of Christ's resurrection, and of their incorporation in Him who is the Resurrection and the Life, be renewed to immortality, so the heavenly bodies will be renewed by fire and delivered from the bondage of corruption. See Rom. viii. 20–22.—The material creation has sympathized with us in our fall, and it will rejoice with the righteous in their redemption and revivification, when their mortal bodies will rise and bloom anew like vernal herbs and flowers, in the glorious spring-tide of the resurrection. See Eusebius, Severus and others here in the *Catenâ*, Cramer, p. 100.—Thus the benefits of the incarnation and the redemption wrought by the second Adam extend also to the natural world. He has restored already the free use of the creatures to *us* (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 23), and He will raise the Creation itself to a more glorious state of being."—M.]

Ver. 14. **Wherefore, beloved, expecting these things, be diligent**, etc.—The Apostle founds here an exhortation to holiness on the last named circumstance [*i. e.*, the expectation of the new heavens and the new earth.—M.], as in v. 11, on the expectation of that catastrophe.—*Ἄσπιλοι*; cf. 1 Peter i. 19; 1 Tim. vi. 14; Jas. i. 27.—*Ἀμώμητοι*, Phil. ii. 15, like *ἀμύμων*, blameless; that you cannot be blamed; for the opposite, see ch. ii. 13.—*Αὐτῷ*, in His judgment, before Him, connect with *εὑρεθῆναι*; cf. 2 Cor. xii. 20.—*Εὑρεθῆναι*, 1 Peter i. 7; ii. 22, in His day.—*Ἐν εἰρήνῃ*. De Wette explains it: For your peace=*εἰς εἰρήνην*; but in that case the Apostle would certainly have expressed it. Better Calov: "In peace with God and with men." [Alford suggests, that considering the familiarity of the Eastern tongue with the expression *ἐν εἰρήνῃ*, the phrase may have an onward as well as a present meaning, as in *πορεύεσθαι ἐν εἰρήνῃ* and *εἰς εἰρήνην*, Acts xvi. 36: Jas. ii. 16; Luke vii. 50; viii. 48; and denote that eternal peace of which all earthly peace is but a feeble foretaste.—M.] More specific definition of *ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι*. Gerhard: "Strive that the Lord at His coming may find you peaceful and reconciled." The thought is connected with *δικαιοσύνη*, v. 13. Dietlein thinks that it is added with reference to the subject about to be stated by the Apostle, viz., the peace-destroying animosity of the deceivers, and refers to Jude 19. But Peter states first something else. It has a good meaning with reference to the many internal and external peace-breakers, especially at that time, Heb. xii. 14.

Ver. 15. **And account the longsuffering of our Lord your salvation**, [see Appar Crit.—M.]; *μακροθυμίαν*, cf. v. 9; Rom. ii. 4: ix. 22. Every postponement of the day of judgment is also an extension of grace for believers, as far as they may make further progress in holiness. Dietlein: "Apart from it, every converted Christian, reviewing his conversion, is constrained to admit that unless the longsuffering of God did insert a development-process of sin and redemption between apostacy and judgment, his conversion would have been impossible and the merited judgment would have overtaken him also." To this must be added the observation that since the text reads *σωτηρίαν* in general, not *σωτηρίαν ὑμῶν*, the salvation of many others also is founded on this longsuffering. [After this exegesis, it is difficult to understand why Fronmüller retains the old Lutheran rendering.—M.] Roos: "The

passage must not be limited to those persons who live at that time, but rather be extended to those who may still be born, if the long-suffering of God preserves this present world for a long time."

Even as also our beloved brother Paul —hath written unto you.—The deceivers, to whom Peter refers, probably abused the Epistles of the Apostle St. Paul, and represented Peter and Paul as contradicting each other; on this account Peter cites the testimony of Paul as confirmatory of his doctrine, and shows that between Paul and himself there is an intimate communion of spirit, and that the incident, mentioned Gal. ii. 11, was unable to extinguish his love.

As also, relates, not to what immediately precedes, but to the whole exhortation, vv. 14. 15, to holiness in view of the coming of Christ. Dietlein supposes that since the *μακροθυμία* of God is treated of only in Rom. ii. 4; ix. 22, the reference is evidently to the Epistle to the Romans, but the supposition that *καθὼς* is to be thus limited, is wrong, and *ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν* is decidedly opposed to it. Peter must allude to an Epistle of Paul, which, like the present Epistle of Peter, is addressed to the Christians of Asia Minor. To say that the Epistle to the Romans was addressed to Gentiles in general, is no sufficient explanation. Hence Bengel, Gerhard, al., think it to be the Epistle to the Hebrews on account of ch. ix. 26, etc.; x. 25, 37; others, the Epistle to the Ephesians, on account of ch. iv. 30; vi. 8; Col. iii. 4, 24. The reference is perhaps to all these; de Wette conjectures 1 Thess. iv, 13; v. 11, and 2 Thess. ii. 16; but the above named reason is against this view [which is also that of Alford, who meets the objection founded on *ὑμῖν*, by saying that this Epistle is addressed to all Christians alike, cf. ch. i. 1; and that all that can be inferred from *ὑμῖν* amounts to this, that this Epistle belongs to a date when the Pauline Epistles were no longer the property only of the Churches to which they were written, but were dispersed through, and were considered to belong to the whole Christian Church.—Benson considered the reference to be the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians and Colossians, because addressed to Asia Minor Churches; this is also the opinion of Wordsworth, who notices also that this text is quoted by Origen *de Recta Fide*, sect. II., and ascribed by him without any hesitation to St. Peter.—M.]

Our beloved brother.—Brother must be taken in the narrow sense of "fellow-apostle." How beautiful is this trait of Peter's character, that he harboured no unkind remembrance of the sharp rebuke which Paul, who excelled him in his labours for the kingdom of God, had administered to him, and that he joyfully acknowledged his Apostolic calling.

According to the wisdom.—Dietlein: "Not so much preëminence in knowledge as aptitude in teaching, knowledge which peculiarly qualifies for teaching; hence ministerial grace accorded to him." Chrysostom does not hesitate to prefer Paul as a teacher to all others and to call him the teacher of all wisdom. [Polycarp *ad Philipp.* I. 3; "No one like me can equal the wisdom of the blessed Paul, who being absent *wrote to you Epistles* (*ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς*) into which, if you look diligently, you will be enabled to be built up unto the faith."—M.]

Ver. 16. **As also in all his Epistles, speaking in them of these things.**—Ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς. Even if the Article is retained, which is probably spurious, there is no necessity to suppose here a reference to all the Epistles of Paul as a finished whole. It cannot be determined which and how many of the Pauline Epistles were known to Peter.—Ὡς sc. ἔγραψε; περὶ τούτων; of the coming of Christ, the end of the world and of what is connected with those events; stedfastness in faith and zeal in good works. Here Peter might refer more particularly to the Epistles to the Thessalonians.

Among which are some things difficult to understand.—ἐν οἷς. Gerhard: "Peter here makes no direct reference to the Pauline Epistles, but to the subjects of which they treat, among which are some hard to understand," which belongs to the nature of the last things.—Ἃ στρεβλοῦσιν; στρεβλόω from στρέβλη, an instrument of torture, a rock, a screw, a press, hence to screw, to strain, to wind, to twist or distort. A very striking word, peculiar to Peter, to describe the perversion of the Scriptures. As to the things themselves Bengel refers to 2 Tim. ii. 18; Gerhard, to false views of the millennium, of justification by faith, of Christian liberty, of the coming of Antichrist, and especially to the justification and excuses of lawless extravagancies.

The ignorant and unstable.—The reference is perhaps rather to the deceived than to the deceivers and scoffers, for whom these two words would be too mild. On ἀστήρικτοι, cf. ch. ii. 14.

As also the other Scriptures; ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς. Here again the reference is not to a completed collection of the writings of the New Testament, from which the inference might be drawn that this Epistle is of a comparatively late origin. De Wette, without sufficient reasons, understands passages of Scripture. The reference is probably to the Pauline Epistles, the Epistle of James and the prophetical writings, which, according to v. 2 and ch. i. 20, must not be excluded.

To their own perdition.—Cf. ch. ii. 2; Deut. iv. 2; xii. 32; Rev. xxii. 19. Huther: "The perversion of the Scriptures has this consequence, since they use their distorted sayings in order to harden themselves in their carnal lusts." We have only to add, that they also bring perdition on themselves because they deprive others of salvation.

Ver. 17. **Ye, therefore, beloved, knowing it before, beware, lest being led away together with the error of the lawless.**—Final exhortation not to suffer themselves to be made to waver in their hope by the error of the ungodly, and to grow in grace and knowledge.—Προγινώσκοντες. Bengel supplies: the danger Dietlein refers it to the imminent attempts of deception. The Lord Himself set great value on the foretelling and fore-knowing of the future. Cf. Jno. xiv. 29; xvi. 4.—Φυλάσσεσθε, ἵνα μή. Take heed, be on your guard that ye—fall not from.—Thus taken, the construction is not singular; cf. Lke. xii. 15; Acts xxi. 25; 1 Jno. v. 21.—Ἀθέσμων, ch. ii. 7; iii. 3; πλάνη, ch. ii. 18, error, delusion,

not deception, as Dietlein maintains;—συναπαχθέντες. Cf. Gal. ii. 13. Similar to what is said of sins, that, like the wind, they have taken us away, Is. lxiv. 6. [Alford notes the remarkable coincidence, that Peter, well acquainted as he was with the writings of Paul, should have written this word, which is the very one used by that Apostle of Barnabas, at Antioch, when he συναπήχθη with the hypocrisy of Peter and the other Jews.—M.];—συναπαχθέντες, together with them and others which they had long since deceived.

Ye fall from your own stedfastness.—ἐκπίπτειν. Cf. Gal. v. 4, to fall from, to be banished;—στηριγμός, standing fast, stedfastness in faith and hope; contrast to v. 16, above. He refers to ch. i. 12 where he declared his readers to be established in the truth. Roos: "The state of grace is the fortress. There God Himself is the stronghold and castle; Christ the rock on which we are builded; there we are assured by the privilege, that all things must work together for good to them that love God; there we are, by the power of God, kept unto salvation. A Christian falls from this his own fortress, if he loses grace, and neglecting to watch and pray and to attend to the word of God, gradually yields to the commission of intentional sins, which, whether by some thoroughly matured dogma or only by hasty judgments, he erroneously regards now in a very different light, and consequently excuses or even justifies."—Ἰδίου. Gerhard: "Not, as though they could of their own strength persevere in faith, but because only true believers continue firm to the end."—There is no reference here to continuance in communion with the Church.

VER. 18. **But grow in the grace**, etc.—Gerlach: "The best preservation is continual practice of faith, continual growth in grace and knowledge: then we are proof against all assaults." Similarly Calvin. ["*Haec unica est perseverandi ratio, si assidue progredimur*".—M.]; αὐξάνετε. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 2; 2 Pet. i. 5; Eph. iv. 15; Col. i. 10. We grow in grace, if we apprehend it with ever increasing faith and keep it, and thus we are privileged to enjoy it more and more richly. Cf. 1 Pet. v. 10.—Κυρίου belongs only to γνώσει not to χάριτι. [This is doubtful, since the preposition extends to both. There is no difficulty if the subjective force of χάριτι and the objective force of γνώσει as connected with Christ is brought out. "Grow in the grace of which Christ is the Author, in the knowledge of which Christ is the object."—M.].—Great value is set here at the close, as before at the beginning of the Epistle, on the knowledge of the person, the office, and the benefits of Christ, cf. ch. i. 2.—Αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα. The doxology refers to Christ in proof of His Divinity. [Alford suggests Pliny's letter, "*hymnus Christo quasi Deo.*"—M.]. Cf. Jude 25; Rev. i. 6; iv. 9; Eph. iii. 21.—Εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος not found elsewhere. Bengel explains ἡμέρα in contrast with night: "Eternity is a day without night, purely and perpetually enduring." Huther: "The day in which eternity begins as contrasted with time, but which day is likewise all eternity itself." The selection of this expression is best explained by reference to ch. iii. 8. Eternity counts with God as one day. Augustine: "It is only one day, but an everlasting day without yesterday to precede it, and without to-morrow to follow it; not brought forth by the natural sun, which shall exist no more, but by Christ, the Sun of Righteousness."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Unbelief is generally blind to the grossest contradictions in which it is entangled, even as those scoffers do neither see the folly of affirming a beginning of the world and to deny the end of the world, nor the absurdity of the conclusion: "That which has not yet happened until to-day, will happen nevermore." "God has not made the worlds for eternity, like Himself, but they come and pass away. In the case of each world there was a time when it did not exist, and there will be a time, when its place shall not be found. How distant soever the day of the destruction of our earth may be, when it does come there will be men on earth, like ourselves, occupied, as we are, with expectations and hopes of a long future. He that rolls up the heavens like a garment and scatters suns and earths like dust, He only is the Lord. Our science will never reach the laws which bring about the destruction of our earth." Schleiermacher.

2. Although loving gratitude to Jesus, who gave up His life as a sin-offering for us, must after all remain our strongest motive to holiness, Scripture teaches us that the thought of death and the judgment, of the end of the world and eternity, should move us to vigilance, seriousness, soberness, and to be on our guard against the security of the world. If the disciples in their time needed the pre-announcement of Christ's coming and the end of the world, it is doubly and trebly needed in our time. "Hastening the coming of Jesus must not degenerate into an impatient drawing near of the Judge by murmuring against others; we ought the rather be occupied with clearing away and preparation in our own affairs, in order that we may be found in peace." Rieger.

3. "The new earth is the eternal and chief scene of the Kingdom of God, Ps. xxxvii.; Rev. xxi. It will not be uninhabited. As the nature of the earth has been made to correspond and conform to man in his fallen and corrupt condition, so it will be made to correspond and conform to man purified, recovered and transfigured into glorious righteousness. Augustine already teaches that the renovated world will answer to the bodies of men which will likewise be renovated." Richter.

4. Even the older theologians held that the day of the Lord, in which such great and decisive events are to be transacted, in which so many millions are to be judged, must not be made to denote a day of twelve or twenty-four hours. It ought rather to be taken in the sense of a diet [In German, *Reichs*-tag, *Land*-tag, *Fürsten*-tag, literally, day or diet of an empire, county or princes, *i. e.*, a congress of the representatives of an empire, a country, or of princes. The reference in the text is to the name of such assemblies, which although referring to a *day*, continue in session for weeks or months. So the *day* of the Lord denotes not a single day, but an indefinite period of time.—M.].

5. The Roman Catholic Church charges the Scripture with obscurity, and founds her charge on ch. iii. 16. In reply we may notice,

a. The correct interpretation of the passage shows that Peter refers immediately to the difficulty of understanding the subjects treated in those Epistles.

b. These are difficult to understand because they relate to future events, and because the soul-man [so called in respect of the predominance of the ψυχή.—M.] finds it so difficult to understand the things of the Spirit.

c. Chrysostom's assertion concerning the Scripture is irrefutable, viz.: "Whatever is necessary [to be known and to our salvation.—M.] is plain and sure in it, so that all, even the unlearned, may understand it."

d. There are good reasons why many things in the Scriptures are hard to understand.

"Many parts of the truth of God must be clothed in concealment in order to prevent aversion to it, to prompt diligent inquiry, and in order to be reserved as a reward of the fidelity exhibited in such search." Rieger. These difficulties contain a peculiar attraction, a stirring up to prayer, a confounding of our vanity, a concealing of the truth from the eyes of the meddling.

6. If the genuineness of this Epistle be admitted, it affords us a clear proof of the futile pretences of the critics of the Tübingen school in respect of the Pauline Epistles, *e. g.*, of Zeller, who says in the *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1846, II.: "Of the twenty-seven writings contained in our Canon, there is not one for which can be shown credentials of its origin reaching up to the pretended date of its composition."

[7. Augustine says concerning the question arising from v. 16: 'Which are the things hard to understand in the Epistles of Paul?' "Even in the times of the Apostles, certain persons, who did not understand some of Paul's rather obscure (*sub obscuras*) sentences, alleged that he said, 'Let us do evil, that good may come,' because he had said, 'that the law entered in, that sin might abound; and where sin abounded, there did grace much more abound,' Rom. iii. 8; v. 20.—When the Apostle Paul says that a man is justified by faith (*per fidem*) without the works of the law, he does not mean thereby, that, when a man has received and professed the faith, he may despise the works of righteousness; but that every one may know that he may be justified by faith, although works of the law have not *gone before* his faith. For works *follow* him that is justified, '*Sequuntur justificatum, non precedunt justificatum.*'—Since, however, the notion above mentioned had arisen at that time (viz., that works were not requisite), the other Apostolic Epistles of Peter, John, James and Jude, specially contend against that notion; in order to maintain earnestly, that faith without works does not profit. Indeed Paul himself has defined faith to be not *any kind* of faith by which man believes in God, but he defines true faith to be that *healthful and evangelical faith*, whose works proceed from love: 'Faith which worketh by love,' Gal. v. 6. And he asserts, that the faith which some men think sufficient for salvation is so worthless, that 'If I have faith (he says) so as to remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing,' 1 Cor. xiii. 2; and doubtless that man's life is good, where faithful love works, for he says, 'the fulfilling of the law is love,' Rom. xiii. 10.—Evidently, therefore, for this reason St. Peter in his second Epistle, when he was exhorting to holiness of life, and was declaring that this world would pass away, and that *new heavens and a new earth* are looked for, which are to be assigned as dwellings to the righteous; and when he was admonishing them to consider what ought to be their life in this world, in order that they may be made meet for that future habitation; and being also aware that many ungodly men had taken occasion from certain rather obscure sentences of the Apostle Paul, to be reckless of living well, and to presume of salvation by faith, has noted that there are *some things hard to be understood* in St. Paul's Epistles, which men *wrested*, as they did *the other Scriptures, to their own destruction;* whereas, in truth, that Apostle (St. Paul) entertained the same opinions as the rest of the Apostles concerning eternal salvation, and that it would not be given to any but to those who live well. Thus therefore Peter writes." Augustine then quotes this chapter, vv. 11–18.—Augustine, *de fide et operibus*, c. 22, ed. Bened. 6, p. 808.—M.]

[8. Wordsworth, who cites the foregoing passage from Augustine, gives also the following useful table of the testimony of prophets and Apostles to the authority of Holy Scripture:

The prophet *Malachi* closes the Canon of the *Old Testament* by a solemn appeal "to the law of Moses, and to the statutes and judgments." He says: "Remember them," (Mal. iv. 4.)

The Apostle and Evangelist *St. John* closes the *four gospels* with a similar reference. "These things are *written*, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through His name," John xx. 31.

St. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentile world, closes *his Epistles* with a testimony to the sufficiency and inspiration of Holy Scripture: "Abide thou in those things which thou hast learned, and wert assured of, knowing from whom thou didst learn them; and that from a child thou knowest the *Holy Scriptures*, which are the things that are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Jesus Christ. Every Scripture, being divinely inspired, is also profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, in order that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto every good work," 2 Tim. iii. 14–17.

St. Peter, here, in like manner closes his Epistles with a similar exhortation, and with a warning against perversion of Scripture.

St. Jude also closes the *Catholic Epistles* with a memento to his readers: "Remember ye the words spoken before by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ," Jude 17.

Lastly, the Apostle and Evangelist *St. John* closes the Apocalypse with a promise of blessing to those who keep its sayings, and a curse on those who take from it or add to it, Rev. xxii. 7. 18. 19.

Thus the duties of the Christian Church, as the Guardian of Holy Scripture, and the duties of every member of the Church, as bound to receive, to meditate upon, and to obey the written

word of God, are solemnly inculcated by the farewell voices of prophets and Apostles.

Prophets and Apostles pass away to another and a better world. But the word of God, written by their instrumentality, endureth forever, 1 Peter i. 25.—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

There is a twofold day of the Lord, a day of His mercy in which He still causes sinners to be bidden to His Kingdom by the word (preached), 2 Cor. vi. 2, and a day of righteousness and wrath (Acts xvii. 31), which has its various gradations and divisions.—What is necessary to watching and being prepared for the coming day of the Lord? Luke xii. 39; 1 Thess. v. 6. 4; Matt. xxiv. 38; Rev. xvi. 15.—We cannot be translated into a state of peace, rest and happiness, unless we have been purified within by sanctification of the Spirit, and there arise a cessation of the reproaches and accusations in respect of the transgressions of which we were guilty.—If by carelessness or indiscretion we contract once more spots or blemishes, let us hasten to the opened fountain for all uncleanness, that we may be cleansed by the blood of Jesus.—If all things shall dissolve into fire, the idols of secure men will also perish. How ill is it with us, if we have nothing that is fire-proof!—The only means of escaping the terror of the coming of Christ, is a holy walk and godliness. The former relates to other men and earthly things, the latter to our conduct towards God.—Who does sufficiently realize the end of all things, which has come nigh, and which after the death of the body we shall quickly be made to meet?—According to Tertullian, the primitive Christians were wont to pray for a postponement of the end. The Church sings:

Hasten, Lord, the judgment-day,
Thy glorious countenance display;

Ei, lieber Herr, eil zum Gericht,
Lass seh'n Dein herrlich Angesicht;

both sentiments are well founded.—The hope of that new world, wherein dwelleth perfect righteousness and constant joy, a chief means of consolation among all the trials and afflictions of this world.—It is one of the chief aims of believers to strive that hereafter they may be found without spot before the Lord.—Who will hereafter be found without spot?—The long-suffering of God our salvation and that of many others. —Beautiful example of Peter in his attitude towards Paul.—Harmony among the teachers of the Church is as necessary as the joint operation of the members of our body.—To honour the gifts of God in others, is to honour God Himself. —If the forgery of a testament (will) which disposes of an earthly inheritance is a great crime, how much greater is the sin of those who forge and distort the Testament of the Eternal God.—The grace of stedfastness should be daily implored with earnest prayer.—The grace of God and the knowledge of Jesus Christ are indissolubly united.—Christ is duly glorified by us, if we acknowledge, praise and publish His benefits.

Starke:—That must be a fearful day; who does not tremble at the birth-pangs of the last time? But ye holy ones, rejoice, lift up your heads, for your redemption is nigh. Lke. xxi. 28.—Men, be moderate in providing garments, in building palaces, in purchasing precious things. Every thing, even the most precious, must be consumed by fire in the last day, 1 Cor. vii. 30. 31.—The constant recollection of the last day, in which Jesus Christ, the righteous Judge, will give to every man his due reward, is a powerful incentive to godliness, Eccl. xii. 13. 14.—When the heavens and the earth shall have passed away, believers will nevertheless come to a most delightful place, although we cannot now name it or describe its glory, 1 Thess. iv. 17.—Those who do not pursue righteousness and holiness here, will not be preferred to the abode in the new heaven of glory, and still less be permitted to enjoy its pleasures, 1 Cor. vi. 9.—The patience and long-suffering of Christ is our preservation; for we owe it to His mercy that we are not consumed, Lam. iii. 22.—If there are dark passages in Holy Scripture, the darkness is not intrinsic, but extrinsic, that is, with respect to the reader and his weak understanding. But it is clear enough in the order of salvation and eternal life to silence all excuses, Ps. cxix. 105. —If Holy Scripture seems to be dark here and there, be not offended at it, and take care not to despise it; learn rather therefrom its sublimity and thy lowliness, but ever search more and more and persevere in prayer; thus thou shalt get more light: as for the rest, it will be reserved for the perfect knowledge thou shalt attain in heaven, 1 Cor. xiii. 12.—A perverted understanding goes generally hand in hand with an evil will.—Try the spirits, whether they are of God; if not, hearken not to them, do not follow them, and let them not deceive thee, 1 Cor. vi. 9. —A strong fortress needs a vigilant and lion-hearted commander, else it will be lost.—Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall, 1 Cor. x. 12. Watch!—Those who are minded not to fall from their own stedfastness, must above all things grow in the grace and knowledge of Christ, Jno. xvii. 3.

Stier:—If we may sigh in our own case, Lord, come speedily; must we not, on the other hand, pray because of the ungodly, Lord, have patience. Examples: Abraham, Jonah.—Look at all the glory of this poor world with no other thought than the knowledge that all is destined to pass away!

Rieger:—True part of friendship among Christians, to warn one another.—All the notices of the Holy Scriptures concerning future things are given to us that we should be on our guard. Those who only use them to gratify their curiosity, deprive them all of their best properties of salt and light.—The multitude of the wicked and the diversity of the instruments whereby error is conveyed to men, constitute no small power of deception.—How many a possession, the objects of doubt, dispute and contradiction will be saved in the day of eternity!

Richter:—Ye that are fortified in genuine Scripture-truth and in the doctrine in Christ, are in the city of refuge, of which the Jewish city of refuge was a type! Numb. xxxv.

Kapff:—In the great process of combustion the earth will experience the fate of ore which contains silver and gold. The gross, light and

formless parts are consumed, the precious and light-giving parts are preserved.—The earth will be a great light-bearer corresponding to the light of the glorified resurrection bodies.—In the passages describing the glorification of the earth, it is difficult to determine how much belongs to the renovation of the earth during the millennial kingdom, and how much to the glorification of the new earth.—If the earthly is so unclean before the holiness of God that it must be burned with fire, how dare we suffer our spirit to be linked to the earthly?

Lisco:—Of the salvation, which we may attain even in this life.—The inner completion of the citizens of the kingdom.—The salutation of departing Christians.—The renovation of the world at the coming of Christ.

[Sharp:—The reflection that our Lord, who came into the world to die for the sins of mankind, is by His resurrection made Judge of the world, doth not afford matter of greater terror to His enemies, than it does of comfort to His friends and followers. How must it revive the heart of every honest Christian, and encourage him to go on patiently and cheerfully in the service of his Master, notwithstanding the many frailties and infirmities under which he labours; notwithstanding the many slips and errors, that after his best endeavours do attend his course of life, to consider that He, who is to take his accounts at the last day, and to pass sentence upon him, is no other than his dear Redeemer! If we look upon the judgment to come only in this view, that then all the hidden works of darkness shall be brought to light; the secrets of all hearts be laid open; the actions of all mankind strictly examined and scanned; and sentence passed upon every one according to his works done in the flesh; if we have no other view of the last judgment than only this, it would not be very comfortable to the best of us, who are all sinners, and therefore cannot plead our innocence at that great tribunal. But when we consider farther, that it is our Saviour who shall then sit upon the throne; that it is our Saviour to whom God hath committed the judging of us; our Saviour who knows our frame, who is sensible of all the difficulties we have to conflict with, as having Himself in the days of His flesh had sufficient experience of them, "He being in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin;" and that this Saviour of ours will not judge us according to the rigour of the Law, but according to that gracious allowance of the Gospel; the consideration of this will prove an effectual antidote against all the fears, and disquietudes, and despondencies we may lie under upon account of our own unworthiness. Let none of us, therefore, that heartily own our Lord Jesus and His religion, and honestly endeavour to live up to the laws of His Gospel, fright ourselves with such thoughts as these: How much shall I, poor wretch, dare to appear before the face of my Judge at the last day: I, who have so many sins to answer for? Let us but go on in the good course we are in: let us but hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, and daily apply to the throne of grace for strength and assistance against our corruptions; and to our prayers let us add our sincere endeavours to increase in virtue, and the longer we live still to grow better; and then I dare say, whatever sins we may have been guilty of, we shall not need to have any apprehension, or fear our condition on account of them, when we come to die: but we may with confidence appear before the tribunal of our Lord; and expect our part in that comfortable sentence, which He will at the last day pronounce to all His true disciples and followers: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," Matt. xxv. 34.—M.]

[Cf. on ver. 10. H. Blair: On the dissolution of the world. Sermons, III.

Vv. 10–14. C. Simeon: The day of judgment. Works, XX., 349.

Ver. 11. John Owen: Providential changes an argument for universal holiness. 4 Serm. Works XVI., 220. Holiness urged from the liability of all things to dissolution. Works, (Goold), XVII., 524.

Ver. 13. Thomas Chalmers: The new heavens and the new earth. Works, VII., 280.

Vv. 15. 16. W. Paley: Caution recommended in the use and application of Scripture language Visit. Serm. Serm. and Tracts, I.

Chr. Wordsworth: Hulsean Lecture for 1847.

W. Barrow: On the mysterious doctrines of Christianity. Bampton Lecture, 221; Serm., I. 178.

C. Benson: Origin of Scripture difficulties. 1. Existence of Scripture difficulties vindicated. 26. Objections to the existence of difficulties in the Scriptures as an *inspired* work considered. 47. The existence of difficulties in Scripture not incompatible with their object as a religiously instructive work. 69. Classification of Scripture difficulties. 156. Minor difficulties in Genesis. Recapitulation and conclusion. Hulsean Lecture for 1822, 399.

T. Chevallier: The use of historical types authorized by Scripture; the advantages attending an inquiry into them; the danger of abuse, and rules of interpretation. Hulsean Lecture for 1826. 35.

Ver. 18. Jeremy Taylor: Of growth in grace, with its proper instruments and signs. 2 Sermons.—M.]

THE

EPISTLES GENERAL OF JOHN.

BY

KARL BRAUNE, D.D.,

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT, ETC., AT ALTENBURG.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH ADDITIONS ORIGINAL AND SELECTED.

BY

J. ISIDOR MOMBERT, D.D.,

RECTOR OF ST. JAMES'S CHURCH, LANCASTER, PA.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER, & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1867.

Stereotyped by
JAS. B. RODGERS,
PHILADELPHIA.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF JOHN.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

I. THE EXORDIUM (i. 1–4) states the object of the Apostolic annunciation (i. 2) and its purpose (v. 3); the design of the Epistle being superadded (v. 4).

II. PRINCIPAL PART THE FIRST (i. 5—ii. 18):

IF YE WALK IN THE LIGHT (i. 5—ii. 2), IN OBEDIENCE TO HIS LAW IN GENERAL (ii. 3–6), AND KEEPING THE COMMANDMENT OF BROTHERLY LOVE IN PARTICULAR (ii. 7–14), NOT BEING MISLED BY THE LUSTS (ii. 15–17), AND THE LIES OF THE WORLD (ii. 18–23), YE SHALL HEREAFTER ABIDE BEFORE CHRIST.

1. The leading thought: "*God is light*" (i. 5).
2. The first inference: *true fellowship* (i. 6. 7).
3. The second inference: *perception and confession of sins* (i. 8–10).
5. The third inference: *reconciliation and redemption* (ii. 1. 2).
6. Mark of the walk in the light; *obedience to His commandments, especially brotherly love* (ii. 3–11).
6. Consolatory warning against love of the world (ii. 12–17).
7. Warning and consolation against antichrist (ii. 18–28). Description of his forerunners, whose appearing points to the last time (ii. 18–23); Exhortation of the faithful to stedfastness in their assurance of having the truth and eternal life (ii. 24–28).

III. PRINCIPAL PART THE SECOND (ii. 29—v. 12):

HE THAT IS BORN AGAIN (OUT) OF (THE BEING OF) GOD THE RIGHTEOUS (ii. 29), IS A MIRACLE OF HIS LOVE NOW AND HEREAFTER (iii. 1–3), IS BOUND BY HIS WILL (iii. 4–10a), ESPECIALLY TO PRACTISE BROTHERLY LOVE (iii. 10b–18), IS BLESSED BEFORE HIM AND IN HIM (iii. 19–24), TRYING, LIKE GOD, THE FALSE SPIRITS (iv. 1–6), HE ENJOYS THE LOVE OF GOD AND EXHIBITS BROTHERLY LOVE (iv. 7–21), HE TRIUMPHS OVER THE WORLD AND IS SURE OF ETERNAL LIFE (v. 1–12).

1. The leading thought: *He that is born again of God the Righteous doeth righteousness* (ii. 29).
2. The glory of the Sonship (iii. 1–3).
3. The way of God's children passes through God's law (iii. 4–10a).
4. Brotherly love is the sum-total of the Divine law (iii. 10b–18).
5. The blessed consequences of our adoption by God (iii. 19–24).
6. Warning and exhortation with reference to false teachers (iv. 1–6).

7. Brotherly love and Divine love as related to each other on the ground of Christ's advent (iv. 7–21).

8. The power of faith (v. 1–5), its testimony (v. 6–10) and substance (v. 11. 12).

IV. THE CONCLUSION (v. 12–21) REMINDS US OF THE GIFT OF ETERNAL LIFE (v. 13), OF THE CONFIDENCE THAT OUR PRAYERS ARE HEARD (vv. 14. 15), EXHORTS US TO INTERCEDE FOR ERRING BRETHREN (vv. 16. 17), AND REMINDING US OF THE CERTAINTY OF OUR REDEMPTION FROM SIN (v. 18), DEHORTS US IN VIEW OF THE WORLD (v. 19) AND THE REDEEMER (v. 20) FROM IDOLATRY (v. 21).

This attempted analysis will have to be justified by the exposition, but the situation of the question has to be noted here in brief. Formerly nobody thought of seeking and finding in this Epistle a well-ordered train of thoughts, or even definite and connected groups of thought. Augustine (*Expos. in Ep. Joh.*) contented himself with the remark: "*locuturus est multa et prope omnia de caritate.*" Thus Luther in his two expositions says: "The main substance of this first Epistle relates to love." "The Apostle's object in this Epistle is to teach faith against heretics, and true love against the vicious."—Calvin (in his Commentary on the New Testament) says: "*doctrinam exhortationibus mistam continet. Disserit enim de eterna Christi deitate, simul de incomparabili, quam mundo patefactus secum attulit, gratia; tum de omnibus in genere beneficiis, ac præsertim inæstimabilem divinæ adoptionis gratiam commendat atque extollit. Inde sumit exhortandi materiam; et nunc quidem in genere pie sancte vivendum admonet, nunc de caritate præcipit. Verum* nihil horum continua serie facit; nam sparsim docendo et exhortando varius est: præsertim vero multos est in urgenda fraterna intellectione. Alia quoque breviter attingit." Lutheran expositors, *e. g.*, Valentine Löscher and Rappolt thought that the Epistle was written without method; the latter described John's method as aphoristic. Not until the 18th century, more definitely since the middle of that century, the programme of Joachim Oporin of Göttingen led to progress in the recognition of a plan and order in this Epistle. Bengel recognized the exordium (i. 1–4), the *tractatio* (namely the special one i. 5–iv. 21, and the more general v. 1–12), and the conclusion (v. 13–21).—Lücke with his ten sections approached again the aphoristic plan (i. 1–4; i. 5–ii. 2; ii. 3–17; ii. 18–28; ii. 29–iii. 10; iii. 10–24; iv. 1–6; iv. 7–v. 5; v. 6–12; v. 13–21).—After v. Hoffmann's lead (in *Schriftbeweis* 2, 2. p. 335–337), who, independently of the exordium (i. 1–4), and the conclusion (v. 18–21), divides the Epistle into four parts (i. 1–ii. 11; ii. 12–28; ii. 29–iii. 22; iii. 23–iv. 21; v. 1–17), Luthardt in his programme of 1860 adopted the following division after the exordium: i. 5–ii. 11; ii. 12–ii. 27; ii. 27–iii. 24a; iii. 24b–iv. 21; v. 1–21.—Ebrard has six divisions; i. 1–4; i. 5–ii. 6; ii. 7–ii. 29; iii. 1–24; iv. 1–v. 3a; v. 3b–21.—Ewald has only three divisions: i. 1–ii. 17; ii. 18–iv. 6; iv. 7–v. 21.—Huther, who, at the suggestion of de Wette, in the first edition of his commentary had grouped his divisions according to the three leading thoughts:—God is light (i. 5), righteous (ii. 29), love (iv. 8), has abandoned this arrangement as untenable, and adopted the following division in the second edition of his work: i. 5–ii. 11; ii. 12–ii. 28; ii. 29–iii. 22; iii. 23–v. 17, leaving it optional to combine the first and second into one. Düsterdieck has, after the exordium, i. 1–4, two main parts (i. 5–ii. 28; ii. 29–v. 5), and a double conclusion (v. 6–13 and 14–21).

Cf. Lücke, ch. v. Düsterdieck, 1, p. XI.–XXVII.; Huther, p. 3–12.

§ 2. CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE.

1. The Epistle treats of the following subjects: God is light, love, righteous; being of God, being God's child, born of God, being and abiding in God; His Son, who is from the beginning, sent by the Father, come in the flesh to destroy the works of the devil, who gave His life for us, who is the propitiation for all, for the sins of the whole world, our Paraclete, in whom is eternal life, in whom we are and abide, whom we shall see as He is: His Spirit, the Spirit of truth, of whom we have: His word, which is eternal; fellowship with the Apostles, with the Father and the Son, prayer, intercession, confidence even in the judgment, the faith which overcomes the world, love of the brethren even to the point of laying down our lives for them, hope that purifies itself;—the devil, the spirit of fraud, lying, darkness, antichrist, the world, the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, the sin which is formally lawlessness, inwardly unrighteousness, the sin

unto death, being of the devil, the child of the devil, hatred, death, idols.—They are almost exclusively ethical ideas, very few dogmatical, and these are immediately delivered of the ethical references they contain, and thus linked into this chain of ethical ideas; *e. g.*, the death of Christ (ch. ii. 2; iii. 16). The author hastens in this Epistle through the whole sphere of life, although his power to do so is derived from a very small circle of ethical ideas. The advent of the Son of God in the flesh, His walk and aim as well as His intercession make up the christology he sets in operation, and the life of the Christian, snatched away from the power of the devil by regeneration and united in church-fellowship with the Father and the Son in his way through the world with its seductive power in particular things and in groups to the bliss of eternal life after death, —this is the sphere of life, the extent of ethical contemplations in this Epistle. We have therefore to deal here as much with faith in the divinity of Christ transposed into life, then with the life in Christ, as with the life in Christ theologically thought-out and leading to faith in the divinity of Christ. While the Gospel seeks to strengthen and enlarge faith in Jesus (says v. Hoffmann, *Schriftbeweis*, 2, 2, p. 337), the Epistle shows forth the moral conduct which is necessary to faith and only possible to faith.

2. But our Epistle does not treat these ideas as abstractions of the mind, but as contemplations of life, experiences of life, as facts and concrete manifestations of life. "One cannot tell whether the artless ingenuousness of a childlike disposition strikes us more in this Epistle than the grave high-tonedness of a thoughtful man, because, in fact, both are intimately blended together." (Düsterdieck). The author takes hold of the most weighty thoughts and ideas with a sure, light and dexterous hand; he is perfectly master of them, he has experienced them, they are his own, he is familiar with them. His object is to bring them home to the consciousness of his readers and to make them know them. Hence *οἴδατε, οἴδαμεν, δοκιμάζετε, γινώσκετε, ἵνα γινώσκωμεν, ἵνα εἰδῆτε.* Peculiar is the constant repetition of antithetical sentences, not by way of simple antithesis, but so that the predicate of a sentence becomes the subject of the antithesis or *vice versa;* the antithesis only brings out a new feature and thus carries on the thought, cf. *e. g.*, i. 6 sq., 8 sq.; ii. 4—vi. 9 sqq. 22, sq.; iii. 3–6. On the use of *καὶ* instead of *δὲ*, of *ὅτι, ἵνα*, etc., see Ebrard, p. 9. [He says: *Style* and *construction* remind us strongly of the didactic passages of the Gospel, *e. g.*, Jno. i. 1–18; iii. 27–36, etc. For we recognize in the Epistle the same mode of thinking in paratactic periods and the same preference for *καὶ* in connecting together the different members of a train of thought (cf. *e. g.*, 1 Jno. ii. 1–3, where Paul would doubtless have used *ἐὰν δὲ* for *καὶ ἐὰν*, and surely have put *αὐτὸς γὰρ ἱλασμός ἐστι* for *καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστι*); cf. his taking up again the immediately preceding *ὅτι* in 1 Jno. iii. 20 with the anaphoras in Jno. i. 33; iv. 6, etc., and in general his preference for the particle *ὅτι* which is used in so many different senses (cf. Jno. xvi. 3. 4. 6. 17; also 1 Jno. ii. 12 sqq. with Jno. xvi. 9–11), and the use of the particles *περὶ, ἵνα, ἀλλά.* It is clear that the author of the Epistle, like the Evangelist, is in the habit of thinking in Hebrew, *i. e.*, Aramaic, and moving within the narrow range of the particles ו, כי or די, למען. To this must be added certain other modes of construction peculiar to a Hebrew cast of thought, *e. g.*, the circumlocution of the Genitive by *ἐκ*, 1 Jno. iv. 13, cf. Jno. i. 35; vi. 8, 70 and many other passages, the solution of a relative sentence into a conditional sentence, (*ἐάν τις . . . . οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ* for *ὅστις κ. τ. λ.*) 1 Jno. ii. 15; iii. 17; cf. Jno. vi. 43, etc. The solution of a simple antithesis into a final or causal sentence depending on a word to be supplied (*οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν ἀλλ' ἵνα . . . . .*) 1 Jno. ii. 19; cf. Jno. i. 8; iii. 28, etc. The circumlocution of the Dative of the instrument by *ἐν*, 1 Jno. ii. 3, etc., compared with Jno. i. 26. 33; xvi. 30; and lastly the frequent use of *θεωρεῖν* and *θεᾶσθαι*, while *ὁρᾶν* is only used in the Perfect, and certain phrases such as *τὴν ψυχὴν τιθέναι, θεὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς, ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου ὁ Χριστός, κόσμος λαμβάνει*, the use of *φαίνειν, τεκνία, παιδία*, etc.—M.].—John's method is neither dialectical like that of Paul, nor rhetorical like that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, but speculative, contemplative, noting the substance of thought without marking the mutual relation of the thoughts themselves. Huther strikingly illustrates the Apostle's peculiarity by comparing his leading thought to a key-note that he strikes and causes to sound through the derivative thoughts until a new key-note is struck that leads to a new key. It is the dialectics of contemplation, of experience. "His simplicity and unadornedness of statement are characteristic: whether he refers to the Divine truths

themselves, or addresses his readers by way of admonition or warning, his language preserves throughout the same calmness and decision; he never discloses a passionately excited frame of mind, but we see every where the reflection of the calmness of a heart resting in blissful peace, which makes him sure that the simple statement of the truth is sufficient to commend his words to the hearts of his readers. At the same time a firm, manly tone pervades the Epistle, contrary to all effeminate sentimentality of which the Apostle is so thoroughly free, that while enforcing spirituality of life, he uniformly insists upon the necessity of the exhibition of its truth in *deeds* [*i. e.*, in the life and practice of men.—M.].—It is also noteworthy that while, on the one hand, he addresses his readers as a father speaks to his children, he does not forget, on the other, that they are no longer minors and do not require to be taught new things, but that they are his equals and joint-possessors with him of all the truth he enunciates and of the life which he wants not to create, but to preserve in them." (Huther). This Epistle, "a deed of sacred love," "is to the most simple reader whose heart has made experience of Christian saving truth, immediately intelligible, but also unfathomable to the profoundest Christian thinker, although equally dear and refreshing to both. The very method pursued by the author of our Epistle in taking hold of Christian living, believing and loving from their profoundest depth, and in their inexhaustible wealth, shows with peculiar clearness how the foolishness of God confounds all the wisdom of the world; for that which our Epistle declares with almost playful ease, or at least with the perfectly artless simplicity of a heart which in its real vital fellowship with the Lord possesses all the riches of Divine wisdom and communicates them in holy anxiety of love—that which it declares with the triumphant assurance and joyful confidence of indisputable truth concerning the source and nature of the Christian life, *i. e.*, of eternal life, is infinitely more than all the wisdom of the world together can ever reach, and also more than even Christian wisdom can ever think out or fathom." (Düsterdieck). One cannot fail to see how unexcelled gentleness, tenderness and thoroughness of love are wonderfully blended with the most decided sternness and deep-cutting keenness of judgment. "It does not seem as if only a father were addressing his beloved children, but as if a glorified saint were speaking to men from a higher world. The doctrine of heavenly love, calmly active, with indefatigable zeal essaying everything and never exhausting itself, has in no writing been so perfectly demonstrated as in this." (Ewald). With such testimonies, triumphantly corroborated by the exposition, we may take comfort under the charges that the confusion of the Epistle betrays the senility of its author, who, either with planless abruptness, wanders from a thought he had suggested, or falls into the eternal sameness of an old man (S. G. Lange, Eichhorn, Ziegler). And the reproach of the master of the Tübingen school, of v. Baur, that the Epistle lacks the freshness of direct life, and that the tenderness and profound thoroughness of the Johannean mode of contemplation and statement had too much resolved themselves into a tone childishly effeminate, dissolving in indefiniteness, marked by constant repetitions and a lack of logical energy, may be met by Hilgenfeld's declaration that this Epistle is one of the *most beautiful* writings of the New Testament, that it is peculiarly rich and original with reference to the subjective, intensive life of Christianity, and that the fresh, living and attractive character of the Epistle consists just in the marked preference with which it introduces us into the inward experience of the true Christian life.

[After all this, we may well say with Ebrard to the commentator and his readers: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."—M.]

§ 3. THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

If we glance at the testimony of the ancient Church and pay close attention to the statements of the witnesses respecting the author of this Epistle, all doubt must vanish that the Apostle St. John was, without contradiction, considered to have been its author. The Apostolic Fathers contain several allusions and references to our Epistle. Ebrard gives them along with similar matter in the Introduction to his Commentary, pp. 14–16. [The paragraphs in question, besides the quotation from Polycarp, as given below, are these: Papias knew and used this Epistle: *Κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς* [Papias] *μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς προτέρας Ἰωάννου ἐπιστολῆς*. v. Euseb. H.

E., III., 39.—The anonymous Epistle to Diognetus, written about the time of Justin Martyr, contains many passages, which imply an unquestionable dependence on this Epistle. Cf. Cap., X., with 1 Jno. iv. 9–11; XII. with 1 Jno. ii. 18–25; iv. 4–6; v. 6–12; also Cap., V.–VII.; XI. The Epistle of Vienna and Lyons [*Euseb.*, V., 1] contains an unmistakable allusion to 1 Jno. iii. 16; ὁ διὰ τοῦ πληρώματος τῆς ἀγάπης ἐνεδείξατο, εὐδοκήσας ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀπολογίας καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θεῖναι ψυχήν.—Carpocrates, a Gnostic, who flourished about the beginning of the second century at Alexandria, sought to use for his purpose, 1 Jno. v. 19. "*Mundus in maligno positus est*," see Origen *in Genes.*, cap. I., Opp., I. p. 23,—M.].—The most important testimony is that of Polycarp, the disciple of John, who suffered martyrdom, A. D. 168, as found in his Epistle to the Philippians c. vii.: πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι ἀντίχριστός ἐστι; which Ebrard calls "an unmistakably clear reminiscence", and Düsterdieck "a free use of Jno. iv. 2. 3."—Very important is the testimony of the Canon of the New Testament, which was edited by Muratori about a hundred years ago and is known as the Muratorian Canon. According to Wieseler's careful investigation (see *Studien und Kritiken*, 1847, pp. 815–857) it was written A. D. 170 by a Church-teacher for the purpose of instructing catechumens in the documents of the Christian faith which were received in his Church. We read, thereafter, notices of the fourth Gospel and its origin: "*Quid ergo mirum, ei Johannes tam constanter singula etiam in epistolis suis proferat, dicens in semet ipso* (1 Jno. i. 1): *quæ vidimus oculis nostris et auribus audivimus et manus nostræ palpaverunt, haec scripsimus; sic enim non solum visorem, sed et auditorem, sed et scriptorem omnium mirabilium domine per ordinem profitetur.*" And again after an enumeration of the Pauline Epistles: "*Epistolæ sane Judæ et superscripti Johannes duæ in Catholica habentur.*" This reference to the two Epistles of St. John must not be construed as denoting either the second and third, as if the citation from the first Epistle rendered further reference to it unnecessary (Schleiermacher, Lindner and Ebrard in *Herzog's R. E.*, p. 98), or the first and the third, the second being regarded as an appendix to the first (Hug), but the first and the second, as Catholic Epistles proper, the second Epistle, addressed to the κυρία, being considered to have been written not for a single person, but for a congregation; it is consequently the third Epistle which is not mentioned, not because its Johannean authorship was called in question, but because it was regarded as less instructive and as a private letter addressed to an individual.

The *Peschito*, belonging to the same age as the Muratorian fragment, also bears witness to the authenticity of this Epistle.—Quotations from this Epistle grow more frequent after the beginning of the third century in the writings of Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Cyprian.—It is very probable, but without much importance, that the Alogi, who, on the authority of Epiphanius, rejected the Gospel and Revelation of St. John, rejected also the first Epistle. Nor can it be of any moment that Marcion and his followers did not enumerate the writings of John in their Canon. Eusebius, whose defects in statement, pompous style, and disjointed treatment are considerably excelled and counterbalanced by his comprehensive and laborious historical researches, includes the Epistle among the *Homologoumena* (*H. E.*, III., 24. 25), and Jerome (*de viris illust. c.* 9) says: "*ab universis ecclesiasticis viris probatur.*"—Most excellent is also on this point Tischendorf's short but weighty essay: "*Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?*" Leipzig, 1865. [See also my article on the *Sources of the Gospels* in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July and October numbers, 1866.—M.]

2. This chain of *external* evidence is confirmed by the *internal* evidence arising from the comparison of the Epistle with the Gospel of St. John. Both the range of thoughts and their mode of expression, as well as the diction, are the same in the first Epistle and in the Gospel, and the remarks on the former in § 2., 1. 2, may and must be applied to the latter with slight modifications. Cf. Grimm: *On the Gospel and first Epistle of St. John as Works of the same Author* in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1847, p. 171–181, and *On the first Epistle and its relation to the fourth Gospel, ibid.*, 1849, p. 269–303.—"As in the Gospel we see here the author retire to the background, unwilling to speak of himself and still less to support any thing by the weight of his name and reputation, although the reader meets him here not as the calm narrator, but as an epistolary writer, as exhorter and teacher, as an Apostle, and moreover as the only surviving Apostle. It is the same delicacy and diffidence, the same lofty calmness and composure, and especially the same truly Christian modesty that cause him to retire to the background as an

Apostle and to say altogether so little of himself: he only desires to counsel and warn, and to remind his readers of the sublime truth they have once acquired; and the higher he stands the less he is disposed to humble '*the brethren*' by his great authority and directions. But he knew who he was, and every word tells plainly that he only could thus speak, counsel and warn. The unique consciousness, which an Apostle, as he grew older, could carry within himself, and which he, once the favourite disciple, had in a peculiar measure, the calm superiority, clearness and decision in thinking on Christian subjects, the rich experience of a long life, steeled in the victorious struggle with every unchristian element, and a glowing language lying concealed under this calmness, which makes us feel intuitively that it does not in vain commend to us love as the highest attainment of Christianity—all this coincides so remarkably in this Epistle, that every reader of that period, probably without any further intimation, might readily determine who he was. But where the connection required it, the author intimates with manifest plainness that he once stood in the nearest possible relations to Jesus (i. 1–3; v. 3–6; iv. 16), precisely as he is wont to express himself in similar circumstances in the Gospel; and all this is so artless and simple, so entirely without the faintest trace of imitation in either case, that nobody can fail to perceive that the selfsame author and Apostle must have composed both writings." (Ewald, *Die Johann. Schriften*, I., p. 431 sq.). Add to this the bold self-testimony with the impress of truth, ch. iv. 6.—Surprising is the number of parallel passages in the two writings:

FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.	GOSPEL OF JOHN.
Ch. i. 1. 2.	Ch. i. 1. 2. 14.
4.	xv. 11.
	xvi. 24.
10.	v. 38.
ii. 1. 2.	xiv. 16.
	xi. 51. 52.
	xiii. 15. 34. 35.
4–6.	xiv. 21–24.
	xv. 10.
8.	xiii. 34.
11.	xii. 35.
23.	xv. 23. 24.
	v. 24.
27.	xiv. 26.
iii. 1.	xvii. 25.
8.	viii. 44.
10.	viii. 47.
13–15.	v. 24. 38.
	xv. 18. 19.
16.	xv. 12. 13.
22.	ix. 31.
	xvi. 23.
iv. 5. 6.	iii. 31.
	xv. 19.
	viii. 47.
9.	iii. 16.
16.	vi. 69.
v. 3. 4.	xiv. 15.
	xvi. 33.
9.	v. 36.
12.	iii. 36.
	xiv. 6.
13.	xx. 31.
14.	xiv. 13. 14.
	xvi. 23.

Considerably more than half of the thirty-five passages taken from the Gospel form part of the last sayings of Christ in ch. xii.–xvii. There the receptivity of the witness was preëminently necessary, and there it showed its strength; where he made the most vital surrender of himself, there he received the most permanent impressions. This is thoroughly Johannean. Compare on this subject especially Lange, *The Gospel of John*, §§ 1–3, Vol. IV., p. 1 sqq. German edition.

3. The genuineness of this Epistle as that of an Apostle was maintained by the Church without all contradiction until Joseph Scaliger boldly enunciated the notion: "*tres epistolæ Johannis non sunt Apostoli Johannis.*" Then there arose at the time of the atomic criticism of Rationalism S. G. Lange (*Die Schriften des Johannes übersetzt und erklärt*, Vol. III., p. 4 sqq.), who although not venturing to assault the external evidence, made the subject matter of the Epistle the starting-point of his criticisms, and raised the doubt whether the Epistle was worthy of an Apostle; his strictures were as follows: that the Epistle lacked individual and local character, that its agreement with the Gospel gave rise to the suspicion of timid imitation and slavish copying; that John, before the destruction of Jerusalem, was not old enough to produce such a work of senility; that he may not have mentioned the destruction of Jerusalem, because it was a ticklish point, etc.—Bretschneider (*Probabilia*) is a more important opponent; but he lived to become convinced of the groundlessness of his doubts of the authenticity of John's writings. Claudius (*Uransichten des Christenthums*), who maintained that the Epistle was the fabrication of a Jewish Christian, and Horst (in *Henke's Museum für Religionswissenschaft von* 1803) are only mentioned on account of their boldness, and Paulus (*Die drei Lehrbriefe des Johannes wortgetreu mit erläuternden Zwischensätzen übersetzt und nach philologisch-notiologischer Methode erklärt. Mit exegetisch-Kirchenhistorischen Nachweisungen über eine sittenverderbliche* magisch-persische *Gnosis, gegen welche diese Briefe warnen.* 1829. [The three doctrinal Epistles of John literally translated with explanatory parentheses, and expounded after the philologico-notiological method. With exegetico-Church-historical references to an immoral *magico-Persian* Gnosis, of which these Epistles give warning. 1829.—This title is enough to awe even confirmed book-worms.—M.]), who like Bretschneider believed the Presbyter Johannes to have been the author of this Epistle, is referred to simply because of the manner in which he maltreated it.

4. More important are the assaults of the Tübingen school on the authenticity of our Epistle. It starts with the Hegelian idea of God, which makes man truly the other part of God; we may say that the followers of that school have already applied Darwin's theory to their conception of history: Christianity did not come down from heaven in a finished form, involves no miracle or privilege of certain persons, but originated in the inmost being of the Spirit, in the natural consciousness of man by a genuine historical development, without revelation or inspiration by a process in agreement with the general laws of historical development. The real original Christianity was a Judaism only slightly modified by Christ, quite Ebionite as exhibited by Peter and John in the Apocalypse, or Gentile-Christian as exhibited by Paul (Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians and Galatians), who, to be sure, went further in the dogma of the law. Hence there arose a contention between him and the other Apostles, in which men, well qualified to effect an understanding and reconciliation among the contending parties, advanced to Christian views and composed the other writings of the New Testament, which simply amount to unhistorical party-writings [German: *Tendenzchrift, i. e.*, a writing of a certain tendency favouring the distinctive views of a party.—M.], not without legends, and were written about the middle of the second century. This applies also to our Epistle. At first Köstlin (*Lehrbegriff des Ev.*, etc., 1843) and Georgii (*Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1845) pronounced for the identity of the author of the Epistles and that of the Gospel; then Zeller, who as late as 1842 had presupposed the identity of the author of both writings, was the first to declare, in a review of Köstlin's work, that it was conceivable that the Epistles and the Gospel were written by different authors. This view was raised by Baur, the leader of that school (in *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1848), to apodictical certainty, and according to him the Epistle is *a weak imitation* of the Gospel, whereas Hilgenfeld (*Das Evangelium und die Briefe Johannis*, 1849, and *Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1855) identified and proved the Epistle to be *a splendid type* of the Gospel.—Baur starts on the unfounded supposition that the author manifests the intentional and most studious anxiety (1 John i. 1–3) to be regarded as identical with the author of the Gospel; in ch. v. 6–9, he sees, owing to

an exegetical misunderstanding, a wanton attempt of drawing a distinction between Divine and human testimony, and shows by this the unskilful imitation of the author. From a comparison of the eschatological statements of the Epistle (ch. ii. 18–23; iii. 2) with those of the Gospel (ch. xiv. 3. 18 sq. 23; xvi. 16. 22), and of 1 John v. 6, with John xix. 34, he infers that the mode of contemplation in the Epistle is more material and outward than that of the Gospel, which he considers to be more ideal and spiritual. The idea of the atonement, ἱλασμός (ch. i. 7; ii. 2; iv. 10), and that of the interceding High Priest, παράκλητος, he thinks more suited to the range of ideas peculiar to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and foreign to that of the Gospel. Baur, lastly, considers the Epistle to be wholly *Montanistic*, because it describes the fellowship of Christians as holy and sinless, makes mention of the χρίσμα, and draws an unevangelical distinction between venial and mortal sins. But our Epistle does not distinguish a higher class of spiritual Christians from the lower classes of other Christians, the *Psychici*, but believing Christians from an unholy world; the Epistle *does* not, nor *may we* refer the χρίσμα to the baptismal anointing which is mentioned for the first time by Tertullian; and with respect to the mortal sins enumerated by Tertullian (*homicidium, idolatria, fraus, necatio, blasphemia, mœchia et fornicatio et si qua alia violatio templi dei*), Baur ought not to have made a most arbitrary selection of three, viz., idolatry (ch. v. 21; iii. 4), murder (iii. 15), adultery or fornication (from the inscription *ad Parthos*, corrupted from πρὸς παρθένους), and still less to have remarked that the author does not refer to the outward acts, but to the inward, moral disposition; for that is not Montanistic. If Hilgenfeld considers (1 John i. 5. 7) the statement that God is φῶς, ἐν τῷ φωτί, too material and local [*räumlich*, literally, relating to space.—M.], turns 1 John iii. 4, where sin is called ἀνομία, and 1 John ii. 7. 8, where love is referred to as an old commandment, into an argument for a friendly relation to the Mosaic law, and maintains that the idea of a personal Logos, clearly expressed in the Gospel, is unknown to the Epistle, although ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is considered as identical with the Logos, and ἡ ζωή in Christ as hypostatical,—that the Holy Ghost is not described as a Person because He is called χρίσμα, and not παράκλητος, although He is called τὸ μαρτυροῦν (1 John v. 6), that the exhortation, addressed to the readers of the Epistle, to a conduct enabling them to look for and pass through the ordeal of the judgment without being ashamed, militates against the idea of the Gospel, which does not speak of the judgment of believers,—all this is as untenable on exegetical grounds as the recognition of *Gnostical* elements belonging to the post-Apostolical age in the idea of the σπέρμα (iii. 9), the conception of the χρίσμα, and the thought that God ought not to be feared, but only to be loved (ch. iv. 18. 19). Anointing as an Old Testament type suggested χρίσμα in the antithesis of the *Christian* and ἀντίχριστος, the representation of being born of God suggested the σπέρμα, and in that representation the fundamental view of an atonement for all the sins of all mankind prohibits any reference to a dualistic separation and to a metaphysical reason without ethical life-process, and the love of God is not a Gnostical discovery, but a purely Christian and Divine command. Of what avail is all the praise which Hilgenfeld awards to the first Epistle of John (for he solely refers to it without adverting to the second and third Epistles, although the title of his book refers to *Epistles*) and its author, in calling him a great independent thinker, if he nevertheless regards him as blindly echoing the Gnostic system of his time, and having only given a clear, practical impress to its speculative features, and considers the Epistle as less spiritual, and on that account older than the Gospel; and how can he accuse those who reject a pseudo-epigraphical literature of the New Testament, of overlooking the important circumstance that the modern idea of literary property was wanting in primitive Christian times; it has not been overlooked that the modern idea was then wanting, but even more than that, there was wanting all license of any forger. The pretensions of the Tübingen school are by no means borne out by what it gives us. Cf. Dietlein (*Urchristenthum*). Düsterdieck, Vol. I., p. XXXV—CI. Huther, p. 19–28; Brückner in de Wette's *Handbuch*, p. 316 sqq.

§ 4. THE READERS OF THE EPISTLE.

1. Augustine has a literal quotation of 1 Jno. iii. 2, which he introduces thus: *Quod dictum est ab Joanne in epistola ad Parthos* (*Quaest. Evang.* ii. 39). Possidius in his *indiculus operum S. Augustini* cites the tractates on our Epistles as "*de ep. ad Parthos sermones decem.*"

Thus has this designation found its way at least into the Benedictine edition of the works of Augustine, and even into some Latin codices and several other writings (Vigilius Tapsensis, Cassiodorus, Beda). Grotius already knew how to explain and apply it: "*Vocata olim fuit epistola ad Parthos*, i. e., *ad Judæas Christum professos, qui non sub Romanorum, sed Parthorum vivebant imperio in locis trans Euphratem, ubi ingens erat Judæorum multitudo, ut Neardæ, Nisibi et aliis in locis. Et hanc causam puto, cur hæc epistola neque in fronte nomen titulumque Apostoli, neque in fine salutationes apostolici moris contineat, quia nimirum in terras hostiles Romanis haec epistola per mercatores Ephesios mittebatur multumque nocere Christianis poterat, si deprehensum fuisset hoc quanquam innocens litterarum commercium.*"

Clement of Alexandria (*opera* ed. Potter *fragm.* 1011) observes that the second Epistle was addressed *ad virgines* (see Introduction to the second Epistle). It is easy to see how πρὸς παρθένους may have been wrongly transcribed πρὸς πάρθους, and thus originated the corrupted subscription of the second Epistle, which, being used as its superscription, may have been mistaken for the subscription of the first Epistle and connected with it, as Hug conjectures. Or, as in a codex of the Apocalypse, the subscription of the first and second Epistles may have read Ἰωάννου after παρθένου, and thus have given rise to the above mutilation and designation (so Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.*, I., p. 139). There is evidently a mistake somewhere, and since Hug's supposition is even more simple than Gieseler's, it seems to commend itself as giving the solution of the riddle. The matter is not furthered if we suppose with Paulus of Heidelberg, that this subscription originated in πρὸς πάντας, or conjecture a corrupted reading in Augustine of *ad Pathmios* (Serrarius), *ad sparsos* (Wegscheider), *adpertius* (Semler). In this way, it is clear, we shall never find the readers for whom our Epistle was intended.

2. Equally inadmissible is the inference of Benson that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (ch. ii. 7. 13. 14) points to a circle of readers in Judæa, and that of Lightfoot who, connecting the Gaius, mentioned 3 Jno. 1, with the Gaius 1 Cor. i. 14, thinks of Corinth as the Church to which the Epistle was sent. The Epistle is not addressed to any one Church in particular; and this accounts for the absence of detailed notices of a concrete or personal character. The circumstance, that while the Epistle contains only slight and incidental references to representations peculiar to the Old Testament, it expressly denounces idolatry, gives countenance to Düsterdieck's shrewd conjecture (§ 7), that it was addressed to Gentile Christian Churches; moreover, the author's contrasting the knowledge of the true God in Jesus Christ, which includes eternal life, with the dazzling form of paganism and an antichristian Gnosis, is in perfect agreement with the historical notice that John selected Asia Minor as the sphere of his labours, if we have to look to that province for the Churches to whom this encyclical Epistle was sent. But we must not think of a single Church, least of all of the Church at Ephesus (Hug), but of several Churches "of John's Ephesian circle of Churches" (Lücke), [*i. e.*, Churches within the diocese of Ephesus, as we should say, Churches under the especial jurisdiction of John.—M.], perhaps of all Churches to whom the personal labours of John extended (Huther).

§ 5. THE FORM OF THE EPISTLE.

1. Given an encyclical or circular Epistle, and it is manifest that it may and does lack features which generally belong to other Epistles: *i. e.*, the special address and particular salutations. Thus the common epistolary address is wanting in the Epistle to the Hebrews, while the Epistle of James is without the customary final salutations. Barring this circumstance all the requirements of the epistolary form are complied with: γράφω occurs seven times, γράφωμεν once, ἔγραψα six times; ὑμῖν, ἐν ὑμῖν, ὑμεῖς and ὑμᾶς occur thirty-six times, the address τεκνία and παιδία ten times, ἀγαπητοί six times, πατέρες and νεανίσκοι twice each, ἀδελφοί once. The exordium (ch. i. 1-4) may be regarded with Calov (*Biblia N. T. illustrata*, Tom., II., p. 1582. Francof. 1676), who follows Estius, as founded on the usual form of an epistolary address. Lücke regards it as the amplification of such an address. The view of Baronius (*Annal. Eccl. an.* 99, II., p. 964) that the address, like a modern envelope, may have been lost, is as unnecessary as unfounded. The *spirit* of the Epistle corresponds with its form, the former being thus capitally described by Bacon: "*Epistola habent plus* nativi sensus *quam orationes; plus etiam* maturitatis *quam* colloquia

subita." Hence Düsterdieck very correctly remarks (I., p. X.) : "The whole writing rests so thoroughly on a living, personal relation between the author and his readers, the pertinence of the written exhortation is so absolutely pèrsonal, that this ground is sufficient to make us consider the writing as a genuine Epistle. This epistolary character belongs moreover to the whole keeping and structure of the short writing. With all logical order, there reigns in it that free and easy naturalness and unconstraint of statement, which suits the immediate interest and hortatory tendency of an Epistle, while the strict, progressive dialectical development, peculiar to a treatise or homily, is held back."

2. Receiving this writing with the ancient Church as an *Epistle* of John, is therefore every way commendable. Heidegger (*Enchiridion Bibl.*, p. 986) advanced his new view as late as the end of the seventeenth century: "*Accedit, quod scriptum hoc, licet epistola insigniatur, censeri tamen possit brevis quædam Christianæ doctrinæ epitome et evangelii a Johanne scripti succinctum quoddam enchiridion, cui adhortationes quædam pro communi totius ecclesiæ conditione adjectæ sunt. Non enim, ut reliquæ epistolæ, inscriptione ac salutatione inchoatur, neque etiam salutatione et voto clauditur.*" Although Bengel calls the writing *epistola*, he rather regards it as a *libellus*. Michaelis (*Introd.*, p. 1520) calls it a *treatise*. Storr (*Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und Briefe Johannis*, pp. 384. 401 sq.) calls it the *polemical*, and Berger (*Versuch einer moralischen Einleitung ins N. T.*, II., p, 179 sq.) *the practical part* of the Gospel; while Reuss (*Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften, N. T.*, p. 217) describes it as "a *homiletical essay*, at the most a pastoral Epistle, the readers being present." Augusti calls the Epistle an *anacephalæosis* of the Gospel, and Hug, Fromman (*Studien und Krit.*, 1840, p. 853), Thiersch (*Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts*, p. 78, *und die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter*, p. 266) and especially Ebrard (*Kritik der Evangelischen Geschichte*, p. 148, and *Comment.*, pp. 29–39) designate it as a companion-writing of the Gospel, or regard it in the light of a preface as an *epistola dedicatoria* without an independent designation *per se*, but we ought to have some notice or reference to that effect. This view certainly does not explain the want of an address, salutation and benediction, and we shall show in § 8, 3 that such a view is impossible.

§ 6. RELATIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CHURCHES.

1. The external relations cannot have been peculiarly difficult; there is no reference whatsoever to persecutions, like those to which the Christians were exposed either by the Jews as in the time of Paul, or by Nero at Rome (A.D. 54–68), or at the end of Domitian's reign (A.D. 81–96), and under that of Trajan (A.D. 98–117), and his proconsul Pliny in Bithynia. The Epistle speaks of the hatred of the world (*ὁ κόσμος μισεῖ ὑμᾶς*, ch. iii. 13). The notices of the victory of young men (ch. ii. 13. 14, *νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν*) and the victory over the world (v. 4, *ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον, ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν*), point rather to spiritual struggles, in the Church and in the individuals themselves; but they afforded opportunity for a reference to and description of external conflicts. The external relations must have been, on the whole, favourable; at least external fears cannot have been of sufficient moment to be taken into account (cf. Ewald, p. 437 sq.).

2. The disquiet and motion reigning within, which characterize this Epistle, point to rest without. The Churches were not necessitated to cling together and to remain closed by themselves. The writing is deficient in words of consolation, but not in exhortations to brotherly love, to stedfastness in the fellowship of faith and life with the Father and the Son, in cautions against the seductions of worldly lusts and false brethren. The time of their first enthusiasm has passed; their zeal and love lack the vibration produced by the weighty pendulum of obstacles and enmity. The reaction of evil from without is followed by the more pernicious reaction from within; falling away has begun without a violent crisis; the energy of evil, as well as of good, has abated. The first generation which had torn loose from idolatry and the world, and earnestly laid hold of God in Christ, has died; a showy and nominal Christianity has crept into the Churches. Believers, like Gaius, exhibit all the Christian virtues (3 John 5. 6), old men full of Christian wisdom, young men full of vigorous aims (1 John ii. 13. 14), are pleasing evidences of the Christian life. But ambition spreads itself, as in Diotrephes (3 John 9. 10), the lusts of the world assert their claims (1 John ii. 15–17), false brethren arise, and not only tear themselves, but also

others from the true fellowship (ch. ii. 18 sq.; iii. 7; iv. 1 sqq.). And the influences from the world are rather those of pagan frivolity, than those of Judaistic narrowness.

3. The *heresy*, against which the Epistle is directed, is a pagan Docetism. Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God! Jesus is the incarnate Son of God! The Epistle, from the beginning to the end, raises high and holds fast confession as the banner under which we must fight and are sure of victory, thus pointing to Docetism, which had not yet developed into a system, but had appeared as a tendency, as is certified by Cerinthus, the contemporary of John. For Cerinthus held that Jesus was the son of Joseph, with whom the Logos united at His baptism, but left Him again after His crucifixion. Cf. Dorner, *Entwickelungsgeschichte*, I., 314 sqq. Pressensé, *Hist. of the First Three Centuries*, II., p. 233 sqq. The Epistle insists upon knowing and knowledge in opposition to the false spiritualistic *Gnosis* which had already begun with Docetism and opposed to the ergism of Judaism a syncretistic philosophy, and set in motion an ingenious theory operating intellectually, in the place of the work of redemption operating ethically.

In opposition to the pagan Dualism, which is the basis of Docetism in fixing metaphysically the antinomy of spirit and matter, the Epistle points to the opposites of light and darkness, of truth and falsehood, of the world with the evil one, and God with His Son and His children, opposites which are altogether ethical and in the fusion of an ethical life-process, so that the opposing element is overcome, dissolved and rejected, or may and shall be saved.—We do not yet find the full-blown Gnosticism, nor yet the rigid Docetism (as maintained by Lücke, Sander and Thiersch), nor any longer the antinomism combated by Paul, nor yet the later antinomism of the Gnostics (as Hilgenfeld assumes). Nor do we find the least trace of opposition to the disciples of John the Baptist, whom Paul met at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1 sqq.), whom John may have had regard to in his Gospel (John iii. 22–36), and a reference to whom was suggested by the very language of this Epistle (1 John v. 6. 8).

4. The Epistle knows no other division of the Church than that by age, fathers and young men (1 John ii. 12–14). But John gives distinct prominence to the circumstance that every one receives the unction of the Holy Ghost (1 John ii. 20. 27); he joins his readers in the confession of sins (1 John i. 8. 9), does not set himself above his brethren, and acknowledges the inalienable rights of Christians to try the spirits (1 John iv. 1), as well as their own responsibility to the Lord (1 John ii. 28).

[The heresy of Cerinthus and other heretics is thus described by Irenæus in his great work against heresy:

"*Et Cerinthus autem quidam in Asia* non a primo Deo factum esse mundum *docuit, sed* a virtute quadam valde separata et distanto *ab ea principalitate, quæ est super universa, et ignorante eum, qui est super omnia, Deum.* Jesum autem, *subjecit,* non ex virgine natum, (*impossibile enim hoc ei visum est*) *fuisse autem eum* Joseph et Mariæ filium similiter ut reliqui omnes homines, *et plus potuisse justitia et prudentia et sapientia ab hominibus. Et post baptismum* descendisse in eum *ab ea principalitate, quæ est super omnia,* Christum *figura columbæ: et tunc annuntiasse incognitum patrem et virtutes perfecisse; in fine autem* revolasse iterum Christum de Jesu, et Jesum *passum esse et resurrexisse; Christum autem impassibilem perseverasse, existentem spiritualem.*" (*Adv. Hær.* 1, 26).

"*Hanc fidem annuntians Joannes Domini discipulus, volens per evangelio annuntiationem auferre eum qui à* Cerintho *inseminatus erat hominibus errorem, ut confunderet eos et suaderet quoniam* unus Deus qui omnia fecit per Verbum suum; *et non, quemadmodum illi dicunt,* alterum, quidem fabricatorem, *alium autem* Patrem Domini; *et alium quidem fabricatoris filium, alterum vero de superioribus Christum, quem et impassibilem perseverasse, descendentem in Jesum filium fabricatoris, et iterum revolasse in suum Pleroma; et initium quidem esse Monogenem, Logon autem verum filium Unigeniti; et eam conditionem, quæ est secundùm nos, non à primo Deo factam, sed à virtute aliquâ valdè deorsum subjecta, et abscissa ab eorum communicatione, quae sunt invisibilia et innominabilia. Abstulit autem à nobis dissensiones omnes ipse* Joannes *dicens,* In hoc mundo erat et mundus per ipsum factus est, et mundus eum non cognovit. In sua propria venit, et sui eum non receperunt. *Secundùm autem Marcionem et eos, qui similes sunt ei, neque mundus per eum factus est; neque in sua venit, sed in aliena; secundùm autem quosdam Gnosticorum ab angelis factus est iste mundus, et non per Verbum Dei. Secundùm autem eos, qui sunt à Valentino, iterum non per eum factus est, sed per Demiurgum. Hic enim operabatur similitudines*

tales fieri, ad imitationem eorum quæ sunt sursum, quemadmodum dicunt: Demiurgus autem perficiebat fabricationem conditionis. Emissum enim dicunt eum à matre Dominum et Demiurgum ejus dispositionis, quæ est secundùm conditionem, per quem hoc mundum factum volunt quùm Evangelium manifestè dicat, quoniam per Verbum, quod in principio erat apud Deum, omnia sunt facta: quod Verbum, *inquit,* caro factum est, et inhabitavit in nobis.

Secundùm autem illos, neque Verbum caro factum est, neque Christus, neque qui ex omnibus factus est, Salvator. Etenim Verbum et Christum nec advenisse in hunc mundum volunt; Salvatorem verò non incarnatum neque passum; descendisse autem quasi columbam in eum Jesum qui factus est ex dispositione, et cum adnunciasset incognitum Patrem, iterum ascendisse in Pleroma. Incarnatum autem est passum quidam quidem eum, qui ex dispositione sit, dicunt Jesum, quem per Mariam dicunt pertransisse, quasi aquam per tubum: alii verò Demiurgi filium, in quem descendisse eum Jesum qui ex dispositione sit: alii rursum Jesum quidem ex Joseph et Mariâ natum dicunt, et in hunc descendisse Christum, qui de superioribus sit sine carne et impassibilem existentem. Secundùm autem nullam sententiam hæreticorum, Verbum Dei caro factum est. Si enim quis regulas ipsorum omnium perscrutetur, inveniet quoniam sine carne et impassibile ab omnibus illis inducitur Dei Verbum, et qui est in superioribus Christus, alii enim putant manifestatum eum, quemadmodum hominem transfiguratum; neque autem natum neque incarnatum dicunt illum: alii verò neque figuram eum assumpsisse hominis: sed quemadmodum columbam descendisse in eum Jesum, qui natus est ex Mariâ. Omnes igitur illos falsos testes ostendens discipulus Domini, ait: "Et Verbum caro factum est et habitavit in nobis." (Iren. iii. xi. p. 462). The English reader is also referred to the valuable notices of those early heresies in Bp. Bull's *Defence of the Nicene Creed*, iii. 1; Dr. Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, 1829, Lecture VI. pp. 158–160; Dr. Waterland *on the Trinity*, v. 139; and Pearson's *Vind. Ignat.* II. c. I. p. 351, ed. Churton.—M.]

§ 7. SCOPE OF THE EPISTLE.

The Apostle distinctly specifies in two passages the scope of this Epistle, viz.: ch. i. 4: ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη, and ch. v. 13: ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον. The Church therefore has already the joy of faith, the joy of the possession of eternal life; but it must increase and grow until it is perfected; the Church has eternal life, but she must know and be conscious of it. Further particulars relating to the scope of the Epistle may be gleaned from the preceding paragraph. They must abide with Christ, without whom they have neither joy nor eternal life, the object of joy, without whom also they have no undimmed and clear consciousness of what they are and have, of what they may acquire or preserve; John desires to keep his Church with Christ, who is from the beginning, and will come again as Judge, but in the form of a Servant, became our Redeemer and Saviour (ch. i. 1 3. 5–10; ii. 1–3. 22–28; iii. 1–6; iv. 1–6; v. 1–2; 18–20). By obedience to the law and commandments of God and by a faithful following of Christ, he desires to establish his people more and more in the communion of God and in the participation of the Divine nature as the children of God (ii. 3–11; iii. 4–18). In Christian humility before the Father and the Son, and in Church-fellowship he desires to fill them with courage in confronting all proud spirits and the anti-Christian powers of the world; he wants them to be timid lest in any way they should injure the truth, the word of God, or themselves, but courageous and fearless in reliance on God and in the conflict with the world and its lusts and threatenings (ch. ii. 12–21; iv. 7–27). On that account they must not think lightly of the faith, as if the wisdom of the world were superior to it, but cling to it as the means by which they lay hold of Christ and eternal life and of the Father Himself, and make them so thoroughly their own, that thereby they may be glorified in and with Christ (ch. iii. 1–3; iii. 23. 24; v. 1–5). "Thus John, like Paul at the very close of the apostolic age, plants with a firm hand the cross before the Church, as the lighthouse destined to shed its friendly light in all the storms through which she has to pass. The foolishness of the Crucified shall always be her wisdom, and all the efforts of false doctrine shall split on it." (Pressensé, *History of the First Three Centuries*, II. p. 234 sqq.).

[Huther specifies three chief points as essential to the understanding of the construction of the Epistle:

1. The manifest purpose of the Apostle to preserve his readers in the fellowship with God, that their joy may become perfect.

2. For the accomplishment of his purpose he develops the thoughts that fellowship with God is possible only in a holy life of love, rooted in faith in Jesus Christ, and answering to the Being of God, and that the Christian is not only obliged to lead such a life, but that he necessarily does lead it in virtue of his being born of God (whereby he is absolutely opposed to the world, which is ἐκ τοῦ πονηρῦν).

3. The Apostle develops these thoughts both with reference to the anti-Christian lie that had already appeared, and the nearness of the advent of Christ.

Huther then states his reasons for his division of the Epistle into six parts, viz.: The exordium, ch. i. 1–4; i. 5–ii. 11; ii. 12–28; ii. 29–iii. 22; iii. 23–v. 17; v. 18–21, the conclusion, and leaving aside the exordium and conclusion, he says that of the remaining four parts,

The *first* (i. 5–ii. 11) warns against the danger of moral indifferentism, the *second* (ii. 12–28) warns against the love of the world and antichrist, the *third* (ii. 29–iii. 22) shows that nothing short of a righteous life in brotherly love is compatible with the nature of Christians, and the *fourth* (iii. 23–v. 17) indicates faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as the Divinely authenticated foundation of the Christian life.—M.].

§ 8. DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

The material already produced in the foregoing paragraphs furnishes us with three points of view from which we may determine the date of this Epistle; *first*, the Epistle itself; *secondly*, the author, the Apostle John; *thirdly*, the writing related to the Epistle, viz.: the Gospel.

1. From the Epistle itself we glean these particulars:

a. It contains no reference to seasons of persecutions when it was written (§ 6, 1.); consequently it must have been written before the time of Trajan (A. D. 98—117), even before the end of the reign of Domitian, who reigned until A. D. 96, and also after the reign of Nero and the destruction of Jerusalem, consequently between A. D. 70 and 96, and rather about 90 than soon after 70, since the greatness and importance of that catastrophe would render some reference to it most natural, unless a sufficient period of time had elapsed to account for the want of such reference. Ch. ii. 18 cannot be made to supply a chronological date; ἐσχάτη ὥρα is too indefinite an expression for that purpose; besides, the context in which it occurs must not be explained of external events, but relates to internal disturbances occasioned by antichristian heresies. Hence we cannot see with Düsterdieck (I. p. ciii.) a prophetical reference to the judgment impending on Jerusalem, but join him in decidedly rejecting the reference of this passage to the end of the Jewish state, as maintained by Grotius, Benson, *al.*

b. The more so, because cognizance is taken not of Jewish opposition, but of Gentile corruption, the strength of the former having been broken with the destruction of Jerusalem.

c. The Church-life, well-ordered in its course and of many years' standing, points likewise to the time after A.D. 70 (§ 6, 2).

d. The heresies also point to the time after the destruction of Jerusalem to the end of the century (§ 6, 3).

2. The Apostle John cannot have entered upon his labours among the Churches of Asia Minor until after the death of Paul, A.D. 64 (§ 4, 1. 2); he lived at Jerusalem until about A.D. 60; after that time no trace of him is found there. Moreover, the whole tenor of the Epistle forbids the hypothesis that it marks the beginning of his ministry in that sphere, as a kind of pastoral Epistle. Huther, who had advanced this view in the first edition of his Commentary, has retracted it in the second edition: this view is too modern to suit the ancient Church. The Apostle was banished to Patmos during the reign of Domitian, consequently before A.D. 96, and died after A.D. 100, in a good old age. Cf. Lange on the Gospel of John in the *Bibelwerk*, IV., p. 8. 9. (German edition).

3. The *Gospel* at all events was written before the Epistle. If we read in the Gospel, ch. xx. 31: ταῦτα γέγραπται ἵνα, π ι σ τ ε ύ σ η τ ε ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστ-

εύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, believing in Jesus the Christ and *life* in His Name are the end contemplated; but if we read in the Epistle, 1 John v. 13: *ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ,* the reference is simply to the *knowledge* of believers who already possess faith and eternal life. This would indicate that the Gospe. was written prior to the Epistle, that both could not have been written at the same time, and that the Epistle was not a companion-writing of the Gospel. John could not have thus written *simultaneously to the same readers:* the Epistle realizes what is only aimed at in the Gospel.—Düsterdieck (I., p. LIX.) thinks it only possible, while we think it inevitably certain, that the Epistle was written after the Gospel, and believe that this opinion may also be proved by many passages of the Epistle in which thoughts developed in the Gospel are expressed in a briefer and more pregnant form. Compare

1 John ii.	2.	with	John xi. 52.
ii.	4.		xv. 10.
	27.		xiv. 26.
iii.	8.		viii. 44.
	13.		xv. 18. 19.
	14.		v. 24.
	22.		ix. 31; xvi. 23. 29.
iv.	6.		viii. 47.
	16.		iii. 16.
v.	12.		iii. 36; xiv. 6.
	14.		xiv. 13. 14.
			xvi. 33.

As a rule, the briefer form is the later and riper form of thought; a splendid illustration of the truth of this position may be found on a larger scale in Luther's Lesser Catechism, which, being the more difficult of the two, followed his Larger Catechism. But we must not disregard the circumstances under which the Epistle was written, and the relations to which the author had respect. Hence the comparison of the exordium of the Epistle with the beginnirg of the prologue is at any rate irrelevant, because the Apostle begins there in a monologue, whereas he begins here moved by the double impulse of vivid joy in the Lord and tender care for the Church. And the comparison of *ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο,* John i. 14, and *'Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθώς,* does not show that the former expression is more definite, and therefore of a later date than the latter, because that was chosen and held fast with particular reference to the heresy intended to be opposed (against Huther).

[As Dr. Braune's view may fail to carry conviction to the mind of the reader, we add that of Huther (in Meyer's *Comment.*, p. 33): "The greater number of critics assume that the Epistle was written after the Gospel, and that the date of the latter is subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem. As to the first point, the chief argument is that derived from occasional references in the Epistle to the Gospel; but this is not the case; there is not a *single* passage in the whole Epistle, which presupposes the *known* existence of the *written* Gospel." (Reuss: "We need the Gospel as a commentary on the Epistle; but as the Epistle had a commentary in the oral instructions of the author, this circumstance does not prove the later date of the Epistle"). It seems more probable *per se* that John, moved by the pernicious influence of the false teachers, wrote first the Epistle for the admonition and warning of the Churches confided to his care, and afterwards the Gospel for the benefit of all Christendom, as "a hallowed document of the historical basis of salvation," than that he wrote first the Gospel, and then the Epistle. (The general observation of Thiersch, "that, as a rule, the proposition: *writings of a momentary destination, among which most of the Epistles have to be classed, are of an earlier origin than the writings of a permanent destination, which include the Gospels,* may be proved historically true," may also be applied to the relation of the Gospel to the Epistle of John.)—And this seems to be confirmed by some of the very passages adduced to show the dependence of the Epistle on the Gospel. The passage, 1 John i. 1–4, compared with John i. 1 sqq., appears to be not the later, but the earlier, because the Apostle in the former struggles to give a proper expression to his idea, whereas, in the latter

he has already found it, and the expression: ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, compared with Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθώς, shows the latter to be less definite, and on that account perhaps earlier than the former. Moreover, the affinity of the two writings warrants the supposition, that in point of time they are not far distant from each other; and this affinity appears not only in the character peculiar to both, but also in their form, seeing that both not only commence with an exordium embodying the same ideas, but that also the concluding thoughts of both writings exhibit a singular correspondency, cf. John xx. 31, with 1 John v. 13.—As to the second point: while no conclusive proof can be drawn from the Gospel itself that the Epistle was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, it contains on the other hand nothing to contradict the ancient tradition that John wrote the Gospel towards the close of his life. Nor is it improbable that it was not published during the life of the Apostle; at least it is more natural to assume that the twenty-first chapter was added at the time of its publication, than at a later period when it had already become the possession of the Christian Churches. In *that* case John wrote his Gospel as a legacy for the time subsequent to his death; but this would require the Epistle also to have been written at the close of the Apostle's life, but before the Gospel. The Apostle indeed states nowhere that his readers had heard the Gospel *of him*, notwithstanding his reiterated reference to their acquaintance with the Gospel, nor is there a single passage to prove his personal labours among them, although we must not infer from this that he wrote this Epistle when he settled in Asia Minor, after the decease of Paul, as a pastoral introductory of his work there (first edition of Huther's Commentary); for on the one hand, we lack all indications of such a tendency of the Epistle, and on the other, said circumstance may be accounted for by the consideration that the Apostle intended this Epistle not exclusively for the use of those Churches among whom he exercised his ministry, but also for that of others not included in the round of his visitations.—An unbiassed consideration of all the circumstances renders it probable that John wrote this Epistle during the last quarter of the Apostolical age."—M.].

4. Putting all things together, the year A.D. 90 seems to mark the date of this Epistle; so Ewald (*Die Johann. Schriften*, I., p. 471). It is impossible to fix the date of the Epistle with Hilgenfeld, who gives A.D. 150 for the date of the Gospel, at A.D. 125–150, unless it be classed with the Tübingen school among the pseudo-epigraphical literature of the New Testament.

§ 9. PLACE WHERE THE EPISTLE WAS WRITTEN.

It is not known and cannot be determined. Some mention Ephesus, after an old supposition found in several subscriptions by Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach and Matthæi, but hardly entitled to the name of tradition. This is also the view of Bengel, who observes: "*non videtur peregre misisse, sed coram impertiise auditoribus.*"—Hug, Grotius and Ebrard name Patmos as the place where the Epistle and the Gospel were written, the former with reference to 2 John 12, and 3 John 13, as if the want of writing-material pointed to the Apostle's exile. But ancient tradition names Ephesus also as the place where the Gospel was written. See Lange, *Bibelwerk*, IV., p. 26. (German edition).

§ 10. LITERATURE.

Compare, (and it is worth comparing) LUECKE's section on the principal features of the history of the first Epistle of John.

Of the Commentaries of the *Greek Fathers* some have been lost entirely (DIODORUS of Tarsus, CHRYSOSTOM), others with the exception of small fragments (CLEMENT of Alexandria), and others with the exception of fragments not wholly unimportant (DIDYMUS of Alexandria).—The *Catena* of OECUMENIUS, THEOPHYLACT and two Scholiasts have been preserved.

Of the *Latin* fathers we have the *Expositio* of AUGUSTINE and that of BEDE. From the time of the Reformation we may notice, besides the *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* by ERASMUS, two expositions of LUTHER (*Werke* ed. Walch IX., 909–1079; and 1080–1252), the Commentaries of CALVIN and BEZA, the lectures of ZWINGLI taken down and edited as an *expositio* by MEGANDER, and BULLINGER's *Brevis et Catholica Expositio.*

Along with the Lutheran A. CALOVIUS, the Arminian HUGO GROTIUS should be named. BENGEL, in his Gnomon, is here, as always, very noteworthy.

Among the moderns we specify in particular LUECKE, whose Commentary passed through a third edition in 1856, and DE WETTE, whose hand-book has in several respects been happily improved by BRUECKNER. EBRARD has contributed the Epistles of John to OLSHAUSEN's Commentary. Excellent is DUESTERDIECK's: *Die Drei Johanneischen Briefe*, 2 Bände; Göttingen, 1852–1854. HUTHER's Commentary in Meyer's Critico-exegetical Hand-book is very well done; 2d ed., 1861.

For practical exegetical purposes we name after SPENER's *Exposition*, 1699, ZELLER's (Archdeacon at St. Nicolai, Leipzig) *Explication of the First Epistle of John in 206 sermons*, 1709.—STEINHOFER, *The First Epistle of John*, 1762; Hamburg, 1848.—RICKLI, *Johannis 1 Brief Erklärt und Angewendet in Predigten;* Luzern, 1828.—JOHANNSEN, *Sermons on the First Epistle of John;* Altona, 1838.—K. BRAUNE, *the Epistles of John;* Grimma, 1847.—A. NEANDER, *the First Epistle of John, practically explained;* Berlin, 1851. [A good translation of this work by Mrs. H. C. CONANT, New York, 1853.—M.]—WOLF, *Practical Comment. on the first Epistle of John in Church Catechizings;* Leipzig, 1851.—HEUBNER, *Practical Exposition of the N. T.*, Vol. IV., pp. 378–440.—BESSER, *Bibelstunden*, Vol. V. *The Epistles of John*, 3d ed., 1862.

On the doctrine see SCHMID, *Bibl. Theology of the N. T.*, 1853, Vol. 2, p. 359 sqq. Cf. LANGE in *Bibelwerk*, Vol. IV., p. 27. (German edition).

[We may add, besides the General Commentaries, the following works:

PRICÆUS, J., in *Crit. Sacr.*

WHISTON, W., *Comm. on the Three Catholic Epistles of John, in agreement with the ancientest records of Christianity now extant.* London, 1719.

HAWKINS, T., a *Comment. on the First, Second and Third Epistles of John.* Halifax, 1808.

BICKERSTETH, E., *Family Exposition*, etc. London, 1846.

SHEPHERD, *Notes on the Gospel and Epistles of John.* London, 1840.

MAURICE, F. D., *The Epistles of John. A Series of Lectures on Christian Ethics.* Cambridge, 1857.

MESTREZAT, JEAN, *Exposition de la Première Epistre de l'Apostre St. Jean.* 2 Vols. Geneva, 1651.

PATERSON, S., *a Commentary on the first Epistle of John.* London, 1842.

PIERCE, *An Exposition of the First Epistle General of John, in 93 Sermons.* Lond., 1835. —M.]

COMMENTARY.

THE FIRST EPISTLE (GENERAL) OF JOHN THE APOSTLE.

Ιωαννου α in A. B. *Ιωαννου επιστολη α* Cod. Sin. al. [other Codd. read *επιστολη Ιωαννου πρωτη*; l. r. *Ιωαννου του αποστολου επιστολη καθολικη πρωτη*.—M.].

I. THE EXORDIUM.

Chapter I. 1–4.

OBJECT AND PURPOSE OF THE APOSTOLIC ANNUNCIATION (1–3). DESIGN OF THE EPISTLE. (Ver. 4).

1 That which[1] was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with
our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of
2 life; (For[2] the life was manifested, and we have seen *it*,[3] and bear witness, and show
unto you that eternal life, which[4] was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;)
3 That which we have seen and heard declare[5] we unto you, that ye also may have fel-
lowship with us: and truly our fellowship[6] *is* with the Father, and with his Son Jesus
4 Christ. And these things write[7] we unto you that your joy[8] may be full.

Verse 1. [1] German ["What was from the beginning, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we gazed upon and our hands handled, of the Word of the Life."—M.]

Verse 2. [2] German ["And the Life was manifested, and we have seen and testified and declare unto you the eternal Life, as which it was with the Father and was manifested unto us."—M.]

[3] [*It*, supplied by E. V., not necessary; it is better to construe ἑωράκαμεν, μαρτυροῦμεν and ἀπαγγέλλομεν with ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον. So Lachm., Hahn, Theile, Tischend. and Lillie.—M.]

[4] [On the whole, the rendering of E. V., "that eternal Life which was with the Father," is preferable to the German, and the meaning is clear without the adoption of the Greek idiom, "Life Eternal," by Wordsworth.—M.]

Verse 3. [5] [German: "What we have seen and heard, declare we also to you, that ye . . . . us; and our fellowship indeed is with . . . . Christ." καὶ—δὲ; the καὶ adds something, and δὲ is slightly adversative, cf. 2 Peter i. 5, also Matt. xvi. 18; Mark iv. 36; Luke ii. 35; Acts iii. 24; xxii. 29; Heb. ix. 21; John vi. 51; viii. 16. 17; xv. 27.—*Indeed* or *truly* seem to bring out this slightly adversative sense better than *again* (Lillie).—M.]

Cod. Sin. has καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν καὶ ὑμῖν. The first καὶ occurs also in Theoph. and Vulg. (*Cod. Amiatinus*; it may have crept in from v. 2). The second καὶ is found in A. B. C. Cod. Sin. has before this second καὶ an erased ι, as if ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς was to have followed forthwith; καὶ ὑμῖν seems therefore to be copied.

[6] Cod. Sin. has ὑμῶν after ἡμετέρα, but a disapproval in the margin.

Verse 4. [7] B. ἡμεῖς for ὑμῶν, [Cod. Sin. ἡμεῖς and ἡμῶν.—M.]

[8] B. G. al. ἡμῶν; so Vulgate with the variation, "*ut gaudeatis et gaudium nostrum sit plenum.*" Both ἡμεῖς and ἡμῶν have probably arisen from the μεθ' ἡμῶν and ἡμετέρα of v. 3, [ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν. A. C. K. al. Copt.; Tischend.—M.]

[German: "And these things we write unto you that your joy may be fulfilled." Wordsworth: "filled up to the full;" but *fulfilled* is better.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The exordium (v. 1–4) describes in vivid and definite language the object and purpose of the Apostolical annunciation and of this Epistle.—The *affinity* of this exordium with the prologue of the Gospel of St. John is unmistakable.

THE GOSPEL.	THE FIRST EPISTLE.
Ver. 1. In the beginning (ἐν ἀρχῇ) was the Word.	Ver. 1. What was from the beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.)
1. 2. And it was with God (πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.)	2. Which (Life) was with God [with the Father] (πρὸς τὸν θεὸν.)
1–4. The Word (λόγος) in Him was Life (ζωή.)	1. The word of the Life (τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς.)
4. 5. The Life was the Light of men, and the Light shineth (φαίνει)—	2. The Life was manifested, appeared (ἐφανερώθη.)
9. He was the true Light, who lighteneth every man, come into the world.	
14. We gazed upon His glory (ἐθεασάμεθα.)	2. What we have seen with our eyes, what we gazed upon (ἐθεασάμεθα.)

Equally unmistakable is the *difference* between the two exordia; the prologue of the Gospel is a monologue, a testimony and confession, where the Apostle, soaring aloft like an eagle, is raised in calm contemplation above all the tumults of life; the exordium of the Epistle, however, is written in profound emotion under the impressions of a blessed experience in the past, and of the present in hearty sympathy with and tender anxiety for the readers of the Epistle; its address is eloquent, pathetic and lively.

In point of *form* this exordium differs from that of almost all the Epistles of the New Testament, and resembles only the exordium of the Epistle to the Hebrews; it is alike devoid of the name of the writer, of a description of the readers, and of the salutation. But even in the second and third Epistles, although addressed to individuals, and specifying their name or description, the name of the author is not given, his office only being mentioned (ὁ πρεσβύτερος).—As in the Gospel, so in the Epistles, John loves to suppress his name (John i. 35. 40; xiii. 23; xviii. 15; xix. 26; xx. 8; xxi. 20, and cf. J. P. Lange, the *Ev. Jo.*, p. 68. 2). But although he does not name himself, the Apostolical office and vocation of the author are accurately marked; and although the readers are not even designated, his relation to them is made sufficiently prominent, so that we must say that the Epistle is written not only *for* them, but *to* them. But the salutation (χαίρειν) may be alluded to in ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη.

The *structure*, v. 1–3, owing to its liveliness, is not quite simple; it is repeatedly interrupted and has been variously given. The fundamental or leading word (the *verbum finitum*), is doubtless ἀπαγγέλλομεν, v. 3, which for the sake of clearness is appropriately placed between the object of the annunciation and its purpose. The *purpose* is simply and definitely indicated: ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς κοινωνίαν ἔχητε μεθ' ἡμῶν. In defining *the object*, the Apostle seems to struggle for the right expressions, and renders it prominent in a double series of clauses, first, v. 1: ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς—ἐψηλάφησαν; then v. 1: περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς—ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν. He marks it first according to its import and being, v. 1. ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, in the second part of v. 1; περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, and v. 2, ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, and then according to its manifestation, v. 1: ὃ ἑωράκαμεν—ἐψηλάφησαν, v. 2: ἐφανερώθη—ἡμῖν, or first according to its mysterious sublimity and fulness, and then according to the manifold internal relations in which it stood and stands to John and his associates. The Apostle, while strongly marking the object of the Apostolical annunciation after the first series of relative clauses by περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, takes occasion to introduce with the Genitive ζωῆς a parenthesis, v. 2, which concludes with ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν, and cannot be resolved or broken up. This constrains him to connect the sentence, thus interrupted by the parenthesis, with what goes before by ὃ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, and so that, as the sentence begins with a relative, now that the object has been distinctly defined by περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, it also concludes with a relative. We have therefore here no period with protasis and apodosis, but a simple sentence, much enlarged indeed and interrupted by long parentheses, the structure of which however is plain enough and does not allow any other construing.

THE OBJECT OF THE APOSTOLICAL ANNUNCIATION. VER. 1–3*a*

a. The First Series of Clauses.—Ver. 1.

Ver. 1. **What was from the beginning.**—The opening words remind us of John i. 1: "In the beginning was the Word," and of Gen. i. 1: "In the beginning God created." Not the moment of creation, but the purely eternal existence until the beginning of the world and its history. The word ἀρχή must always be defined by the context, *e. g.*, in 1 John ii. 7: "Ye had *from the beginning*," the beginning denotes the time when they became Christians, in ch. iii. 8, "the devil sinneth *from the beginning*," *i. e.*, from the time when he became the devil, which happened immediately after the creation of the world; in ch. ii. 13, 14: "Ye have known him that is *from the beginning*," *i. e.*, from eternity, Jesus Christ.—The beginning of the devil dates from the creation of the world (ch. iii. 8), the beginning of faith lies in the life of the readers themselves (ch. ii. 7), and the beginning here and at ch. ii. 13, denotes eternity *before* the creation of the world. The sense is clear from the parallel sentence, v. 2, "ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα," and corresponds with πρὸ πάντων Col. i. 17, πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου Eph. i. 4, πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι John xvii. 5, or with ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 26. But ἀπό does not equal πρὸ, nor is ἀπ' ἀρχῆς equal to ἐν ἀρχῇ, John i. 1.—In the Gospel the Apostle describes and considers the Existence of the Logos with the Father before the Creation, and then proceeds to denote His agency in the creation; but here the Apostle passes from the Existence of the Logos to His manifestations in history. He *was* therefore *before* the world was, and He *was*, before He appeared in history [*i. e.*, before His incarnation.—M.]. The Apostle looks back from his personal experience to the eternity *from*

whence He came; His eye travels over thousands of years from the beginning to the time of His personal experience. As He became not the Logos when He became man, so He became not [began to exist—M.] when the world was made, began to exist. The reference is consequently not to the μυστήριον Θεοῦ (Theophylact, Oecumen.), or to the Gospel of Jesus Christ (Socinus), or to the *res a Deo destinatæ* (Grotius).—The simplest explanation of the designation of the personal Logos by the Neuter ὅ, is the supposition that the Apostle, moved by the mysterious sublimity and the fulness of essential [belonging to the Being or Essence of Christ—M.] glory (which will not be fully recognized and known before His ultimate revelation in His second advent, ch. iii. 2: καθώς ἐστι), writes with a soaring sense of indefiniteness, and views the Person to whom he refers at the same time as the principle of the world and its history, although this does not pass into a reflecting consciousness [*sic* in German.—M.]. Similarly τὸ κατέχον precedes ὁ κατέχων in 2 Thess. ii. 6; similar terms may also be seen in Luke i. 35; John iii. 6; vi. 37; Heb. vii. 7; 1 Cor. i. 27 sq.; Col. i. 26; 1 John v. 4. The reference is consequently not to abstraction, the Word of Life, the Life (Huther), or to the connection of the Person of Jesus with His history and doctrine (Lücke, Ebrard), or the taking together of His preëxistence and historical appearance (Düsterdieck), or to the mere designation of the Apostolical annunciation (Hofmann). [Braune's explanation lacks perspicuity, and really seeks to combine the views of Huther and Düsterdieck, with the addition of a reference to the second coming of Christ; we doubt whether it will convince many readers, while Huther's explanation, which we give in full, supplies a clear and natural reason for the use of the Neuter ὅ. "The Apostle points to the Apostolical annunciation, namely, the personal Christ, by the Neuter because he thinks of Him as 'the Word of Life,' or 'the Life.' The reference then being to an abstract (*per se*) or general idea, ζωή, the Neuter ὅ seems to be in place. The Apostle might indeed have used ὅς for ὅ, because this ζωή is to him the personal Christ; but considering that the characteristic import of Christ consists in His being *the Life* (not only a living individual) and that John, full of this idea, begins this Epistle, it was more natural that he should use ὅ than ὅς."—M.]

What we have heard—seen—gazed upon—handled is a rising gradation; *hearing* is the lowest degree of the climax, it strikes the ear from a certain distance, perhaps unsought for; **with our eyes** intensifies the word *seen;* seeing indeed may be involuntary, but the beginning of self-activity is already marked; *gazing upon* gives prominence to this self-activity [voluntary exercise of the sense of sight—M.], with the secondary idea of continuance; **handled with our hands** denotes the nearest and most direct intercourse. By "*what we have heard*" the Apostle naturally passes from the eternal existence of the Logos to His historical appearing; the λόγος ἄσαρκος becomes the λόγος ἔνσαρκος. He makes Himself known first and most naturally in the Word. Not what he had heard of Him in the Word of the Old Testament, in the prophecies until John the Baptist, but that he had heard *Himself*. Ὅ cannot be another object than in the first clause; the same word, ὅ, is used in all the clauses, and designates the same object, the Logos; the perceptions and modes of revelation only differ. The Apostle had not only heard words of the mouth, words from human lips, but in such human words, and through them the speaker Himself, the Logos; not the Apostle's ear, but he himself has heard, his soul of course through the instrumentality of the material organ of hearing.—He had seen, as he says, in order to lay peculiar emphasis on the testimony of his ears and eyes, *with his own eyes*, the form of a servant, the Son of man, but of course what lived therein shown forth therefrom in look and mien, in manner and motion; the soul of John, therefore, looked with bodily eyes into the Nature of the manifested, incarnate Logos. Hence again the same object. Indeed He says Himself: "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father," Jno. xiv. 9 compared with ch. xii. 45.

What we gazed upon—handled are Aorists, not Perfects, as just before. This change of tense is neither arbitrary nor inaccurate, but designed and wise. The Apostle had *heard* and *seen* in single moments; these are finished acts, facts with their effects; but now he intends by the use of these Aorists to point to the past as an expiring present, how he had ever and anon had continuous intercourse with Him in the most direct nearness and lively self-activity.—The verbs "*heard*" and "*seen*" rather denote involuntary perception, while the others, "*gazed upon*" and "*handled*," signify voluntary, intentional perception for the purpose of making sure of the reality and nature of the Logos. (Huther).—The man Jesus only was gazed upon, His body only was handled, but through all that sensuousness the Son of God was recognized and felt, and His Divine glory perceived and experienced. We have, therefore, to deal with the same object throughout. The verb "*gazed upon*" reminds us of the language of John in his Gospel (ch. i. 14): "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we gazed upon (ἐθεασάμεθα) His glory;" the verb "*handled*" is connected with the words of the risen Saviour, Lke. xxiv. 39: "Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself; handle me (ψηλαφήσατέ με), and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have," cf. Jno. xx. 27. John, who leaned on His bosom, Jno. xiii. 23: ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ, Jno. xiii. 25; xxi. 20: ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος, denotes thereby the most intimate relation, rendering shaking of hands and kissing proper, and thus places the real humanity and bodily existence of Christ beyond the possibility of doubt. "He patiently allowed murderers to handle Him, why should He not have suffered those who love Him to do the same." (Pfenninger). Thus the Apostle marks here two things, first, the fulness of his perceptions, and, secondly, their authentication. Luther says correctly: "He multiplies words, and thus makes the matter great and important. We have, says he, looked and gazed upon with the utmost care and diligence; we have not been deceived, but are sure that it was not an illusion. He says this in order to make his hearers perfectly sure of the matter." Thus both the glory of the incarnate Word, so difficult to understand, and the authentication of the tes-

timony, so important in its bearing, are portrayed in such lively colours on account of the object.

b. The Second Series of Clauses.—VER. 1–3*a*.

Of the word of the Life is neither an independent appositive addition to the preceding definitions of the object (Huther), nor governed by the last verb, ἐψηλάφησαν (Erasmus, al.), nor, indeed, by ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (S. G. Lange, "What happened to the Word of Life from the beginning!"). It is the beginning of a new clause, parallel with the series of relative clauses as to matter (Düsterdieck), which terminates with them in ἀπαγγέλλομεν. That which before had been taken indefinitely as a Neuter, is here described for the first time as a Person. The Word of Life, *per se*, may stand both for the *Gospel of Life* and the *Personal Logos of Life*, and taken as the *Apostolical Word*, or the *hypostatical Word*. If it be taken in the former sense as *verbum simpliciter* (Bengel), the Genitive τῆς ζωῆς may designate the quality (Socinus, Grotius), like ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, Jno. vi. 35, τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς, or the object (Luther: "we *speak* of the life," Düsterdieck), as in 1 Cor. i. 18: ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ. But this construction of περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς is impossible, because it must be connected with ἀπαγγέλλομεν (1 Thess. i. 9: περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν); the construction with περὶ instead of the Accusative is designed to guard against the possible misunderstanding of making the Word designate the Gospel and not Christ. To speak the Gospel *concerning*, *respecting* the Word, although in the manner of a declaration, pertains rather to the province of science, is more the work of the theologian than of the Apostle. But grammatically it is inadmissible to infer from the parenthesis after ζωῆς, namely from the words ἀπαγγέλλομεν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, that λόγος τῆς ζωῆς is equal to said words, *i. e.*, the declaration or annunciation of life. The *Word*, ὁ λόγος, the object of the Apostolic annunciation, must be, as in Jno. i. 1, sqq., the original, eternal, personal Word, the eternal Son of the eternal Father, and fully accords with ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, with the sole difference that the *neutrum* becomes a *masculinum*, in order to bring out the personal character of the Logos according to His historical manifestation. On ὁ λόγος see J. P. Lange, *The Gospel According to John*, p. 38, sq., Germ. edition.—The Genitive τῆς ζωῆς is explained by Jno. i. 4: ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. The Word has Life in itself, is Life Itself, and imparts Life to others. It is the true, eternal, primal Life, and this Life is the Nature of the Logos, but the object of the annunciation is the Logos Himself. (Düsterdieck).

VER. 2. **And the Life was manifested.**—καὶ adds in a vivid manner an explanation by introducing a parenthesis and interrupting the sentence; ἐφανερώθη recalls Jno. i. 4. 5, "And the Life was the Light, and the Light shineth (φαίνει) in the darkness." The Life of the Logos appeared, was manifested, so that we may infer His Being and Nature from His Life, and thus acquire a knowledge of the Son. This epiphany is the immediate consequence of the Incarnation, of the ἐνσάρκωσις. Jno. i. 14: ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο.

And we have seen—testify—declare.—Antithesis of Jno. i. 5, "And the darkness has (Luther: had) not comprehended it." The climax is: ἑωράκαμεν connected with ἐφανερώθη, he had been a *spectator*, but did not see in vain; for he became a *witness* through intercourse with the manifested One, and in his capacity of witness he fixes his eye on what had become visible, the acts and events which he had experienced: what he thus sees and utters is purely objective without reference to his hearers and their wants or relations, but in the interest in and for the matter itself. But he does not stop there; he now *declares* also what he has seen; he explains and applies at the same time; he unfolds in their fulness, and with a special interest in his readers, the thoughts and facts comprised in his personal experience. The objective is brought near through the subjective. Thus he joyfully recalls to himself that blessed manifestation, and is constrained to testify for himself, and to declare to others, that they also may have such an experience. Ἀπαγγέλλειν = καταγγέλλειν, Acts xvii. 27; and = κηρύσσειν, Rom. x. 14, sq., cf. Matt. xxviii. 8. 11; Acts xxvi. 20. In John's writings, ὁρᾶν and μαρτυρεῖν are frequently joined together, Jno. i. 34; iii. 32; xix. 35; but the last of these passages, like Jno. xv. 27, is without an object, which, however, may be readily supplied from the context. The object of the *three* verbs is **the Eternal Life** (Oecumenius, Lücke, Huther), and not only of ἀπαγγέλλειν (Fritsche, de Wette, Düsterdieck). The life is called *eternal*, ἡ αἰώνιος, because it did not take its beginning in the world, but rather gave a beginning to the world and the life in the world. It is Absolute Life, the source and root of all life in the world, physical and ethical (Lücke on Jno. i. 4). It *was* before it appeared, became visible; it did not *become* [come into being] perchance, when it appeared. On that account the Apostle adds ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.—The relative ἥτις is not = ἥ, but = *ut quæ*, hence, eternal life as which it was, that is to say, which *was* (ἦν) as such before its revelation in the *direction towards the Father*, not with, alongside of Him; it denotes not a mere juxtaposition, but a being together, having mutual intercourse; it is directed towards Him, turned to Him, longing for and leading to Him, according to its nature. It is not *in the Father*, but from Him, and hence directed towards Him. Here is asserted of the ζωή what Jno. i. 1 predicates of the λόγος; in Him truly is such life, in Him also it has become manifest. Because John had just had such a lively conception of the Life of the Logos, he was able to begin in the Neuter, ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς; for it *is* without the world, before the world, with and for God in the Logos.

And was manifested unto us.—*Eternal* Life has appeared, and just now become manifest to us the Apostles. Thus closes the parenthesis with a return to the thought at the beginning, and it is because of this conclusion (ἐφανερώθη) that John resumes the interrupted sentence, the words "**what we have seen and heard**" being placed before, and, in consequence of the prolonged interruption, breaks off and drops the series of clauses beginning with περὶ τοῦ λόγου, and resumes the first series of clauses, in a brief and concise form. The object is the same as in v. 1.

The Subject of the Annunciation, VER. 3.

On ἀπαγγέλλομεν see the notes on v. 2.

VER. 3*a*. **Declare we also to you.**—Καὶ ὑμῖν places the readers of this Epistle alongside of other Churches who had heard the Apostolical annunciation; hence John, in using the Plural in the verbs from v. 1 onward and ἡμῖν in v. 2, probably did not only refer to himself after the manner of authors, but to himself and his brethren, more particularly to the disciples of Jesus and the Apostles; the opposition of ἡμῖν and ὑμῖν is only the opposition of the first Christians and the immediate disciples of the Lord, or the Apostles and the Churches formed by the instrumentality of the former, or founded by the agency of the latter. John is fond of including himself among the whole of Christendom, ch. i. 6–8; ii. 1. 28; iii. 1. But the comparison of Jno. xv. 27 seems to render it probable that John in this place speaks of himself as connected with the Apostles, the reference being to the founding and conservation of Christian Churches. He does not stand alone, but like him all the Apostles have heard, seen and handled, and bear witness with him.

Purpose of the Annunciation, VER. 3*b*.

VER. 3*b*. **That ye also may have fellowship with us.**—The word *also*, καὶ before ὑμεῖς after the preceding καὶ ὑμῖν, renders it very prominent that the purpose of the Apostolical annunciation is always and every where the same with all the Apostles in all Churches, namely: unity and fellowship. *Fellowship with us* is not the same as *fellowship such as we have it*, like us, with the Father and the Son (Socinus, Episcopius, Bengel). The position of the words forbids such a construction. It is rather the fellowship *with us*, the Church-fellowship of Christians among themselves.—Μετά (from μέσος, *between, among*) τινος denotes the circle into which one enters, consequently cöexistence, whereas σύν τινι signifies connection with, coherence (so Krüger). The Church of the first disciples, of the Apostles, is the primitive Church into which they must enter in order to partake [of its fellowship—M.]; mere connection with it is not sufficient. The Apostles are and remain the foundation on which we must take our stand (Eph. ii. 20), the mediators who must take us by the hand (Eph. iv. 11. 12); they are the stem out of which the Churches break forth and grow like branches. All (καὶ) the Churches are to be in Church-fellowship with the Apostles.—ἔχητε is not: *acquire* (Fritzsche), nor does it denote *progress* (à Lapide [who says: "*pergere et in ea*, κοινωνίᾳ, *proficere et confirmari*"—M.]), but indicates simply permanent possession, constancy.

And our fellowship indeed is with the Father, etc.—καὶ does not connect with the preceding clause, so that also that which follows depends on ἵνα (Luther: and our fellowship *be*, so Augustine, Calvin, Grotius, Ebrard); for there is also a δὲ after κοινωνία [see Appar. Crit.. v. 3. 5.—M.]. The reference, therefore, is to a κοινωνία here as well as in the preceding clause, hence καὶ ἡ κοινωνία ἡ ἡμετέρα; but this fellowship is yet another μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, etc. The other stands in some sort of antithesis to this; it must go beyond the former, and in it come to the latter, hence δὲ. Similar is the construction, Jno. vi. 51; viii. 17; Matt. xvi. 18; Mk. iv. 36; Lke. ii. 35. Winer, p. 393. We have here a separate clause, in which ἐστί must be supplied, which adds a new and somewhat different particular, as if we did read: καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν κοινωνίαν μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς κ. τ. λ., so that they have not only fellowship with the Apostles, but also with the Father and the Son. The thought itself forbids a close connection with ἵνα. The purpose of the Apostolical annunciation is not to effect a union with the Father and the Son, for that is the office of Jesus Christ, the Mediator. The Apostle insists upon Church-fellowship, and that is sufficient, because in it is the fellowship with the Father and the Son; a fellowship with God in Christ is not to be created from Church-fellowship; the Church-fellowship is not without the former, and the former is in the latter; otherwise the Church-fellowship would be no Church-fellowship, the Apostolical fellowship, no fellowship with the Apostles. Κοινωνία is a fellowship with the Father and the Son, so that we form part of Them and are personally united with Them, They are in us and we in Them (Jno. xiv. 23), Their Life is our Life (v. 6). Besides the Father, **His Son Jesus Christ** is particularly named, and thus the full designation of Him ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, of the λόγος τῆς ζωῆς serves to show His identity with the Incarnate Saviour; and thus the conclusion is found. Cf. Jno. xvii. 22–26. [This κοινωνία is one of *essence* and *being*, founded on the circumstance that its subjects are *begotten* of the same σπέρμα θεοῦ (1 Jno. iii. 9), and that the same power of a heavenly and glorified life animates them; so Sander. The definition of Zuinglius deserves transcribing: "*De qua loquatur societate, quodque intelligat consortium, exponit; non qua homines hominibus solum pace, concordia et amicitia fraterna juguntur, sed qua homines Deo animo, mente atque adeo fide hic uniuntur indissolubiter et posthanc cum eo aeternum viventes. Hoc est quod Christus orat Patrem*, Jo. xvii."—M.].

The Epistle and its Design, VER. 4.

VER. 4. **And these things we write unto you.**—*And* not only connects, but continues, leads us further, and marks the next progress; the fellowship just described promotes joy, operates in the depth of the heart. Ταῦτα is neither what precedes (Sander), nor what follows immediately (Socinus), but the whole contents of the Epistle (Lücke, de Wette, Düsterdieck, Huther, Ebrard). John considers the Epistle with its contents as documentary evidence connected with the oral annunciation.

We write.—Although the personal relation of the Apostle to the readers is here more prominent than in the Plurals of the preceding clauses, the Plural is not used, after the manner of authors, for the Singular. John continues impressed with the convictions of the common Apostolical annunciation; he knows that he is in perfect agreement with all the Apostles, that he speaks as they speak, and that their speech is like his; nor does he stand alone, but has his associates and assistants, like Paul (1 Cor. i. 1, Παῦλος και Σωσθένης ὁ ἀδελφός; 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; Philem. 1, Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος; Phil. i. 1, Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δοῦλοι Ι. Χρ.; 1 Thess. i. 1;

2 Thess. i. 1: Παῦλος καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος). *Writing* is indeed another species of μαρτυρία, coördinate with oral communication. Bengel:—*Testimonium genus; species duæ: annuntiatio et scriptio; annuntiatio ponit fundamentum, scriptio superædificat.*" The Epistle seems only to build up and perfect the life already existing in the readers. Düsterdieck.

That your joy may be fulfilled.—The reading ἡμῶν would make the joy of the Apostles over the Churches [*i. e.*, joy, because their word yields fruit among their hearers. Theophylact: "ἡμῶν γὰρ ὑμῖν κοινωνούντων πλείστην ἔχομεν τὴν χαρὰν ἡμῶν, ἣν ταῖς θεριστταῖς ὁ χαίρων σπορεὺς ἐν τῇ τοῦ μισθοῦ ἀπολήψει βραβεύσει, χαιρόντων καὶ τούτων ὅτι τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν ἀπολαύουσι."—M.]. So does Bede with reference to Phil. ii. 2: "*gaudium doctorum sit plenum, cum multos prædicando ad sanctæ ecclesiæ societatem perducant.*" Jno. xvii. 13; xv. 11 cannot be adduced in support of this reading; said passages, besides the reason already stated above in Appar. Crit. [v. 4. 8—M.], may have suggested this reading. The identical language occurs at Jno. xvi. 24: ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη. To be sure, according to Jno. xv. 11: ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ᾖ καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ, the joy of Christians is the joy of Christ, of which they had become partakers. For Christ has in Himself the Life, Life eternal, true, full, unobstructed Life, which is happiness and peace. Whoso derives Life from Christ becomes a convalescent, recovers health, the health of the soul, and that is peace and joy. Surely, he who is holy, must be happy, and none but the holy and sanctified are happy. If Christ's high-priestly intercession (Jno. xvii. 13) still continues the object and ground of great joy, it contemplates also the growth of joy in individuals going on to eternity, even as John remarks in a private Epistle addressed to a friend (2 Jno. 12).—Hence Christ speaks of His joy, which shall become our joy, even as Christ's Life shall become our Life through faith; hence χαρὰ πίστεως, Phil. i. 25.—*Given* is the joy by Him, but only like a grain of wheat, which must grow in order to become perfect and to yield fruit. But that which is to be perfected must *exist*. The perfection, however, is not instantaneous, magical or miraculous, but has its stages and maladies of development,—struggles—dangers; hence: ἡ πεπληρωμένη. Now this takes place in the fellowship, both in that of the Church and in that with the Father and the Son; there, joy is not only a transient emotion, but an habitual state becoming ever more perfect. Luther (*Schol.* ed. Bruns.):—"*Principium hujus gaudii est, quum incipimus credere; postea quum fides augescit meditando, docendo, studendo, tum fit plenum gaudium.*" The reason why the Apostle dwells on joy (χαρὰ) rather than on peace, may be that at the beginning of the Epistle he thinks with reference to the readers of the greeting, χαίρειν, which, apart from the Epistle of Claudius Lysias to Felix (Acts xxiii. 26–30), occurs only in the circular of the Apostles at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 23) and at James i. 1. [Wordsworth contrasts the πλήρωμα χαρᾶς with the πλήρωμα of the Gnostics. —M.]

[Düsterdieck:—"The peace of reconciliation, the blessed consciousness of sonship, the happy growth in holiness, the bright prospect of future completion and glory,—all these are but simple details of that which in all its length and breadth is embraced by one word, Eternal Life, the real possession of which is the immediate source of our joy. We have joy, Christ's joy, because we are blessed, because we have Life itself in Christ." Compare the beautiful extract from Augustine, below in *Doctrinal and Ethical*, No. 7. —M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. On the word λόγος cf. J. P. Lange on Jno. i. 1, Vol. IV., p. 41, sq., of the *Bibelwerk*, German edition.—It is characteristic of John, and perfectly analogous to the Gospel, to start from the historical stand-point, vv. 1. 2. 3., cf. Jno. i. 14, and draw the *à posteriori* conclusion of the Eternal Being and Nature, and then taking there, as it were, a firm position, to trace the epiphanies and operations of the Logos in the world, in time and among men. On this account the Apostle begins here, as in the Gospel, with the Prëexistence of the Logos (ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος, ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα). He does not lose himself in the genesis of the Logos, like the Gnostics with their theogonies, but only dwells upon His *Being*, as ζωὴ αἰώνιος, in relation to the Father (πρὸς τὸν πατέρα). Hence we must not connect the λόγος and the ζωὴ as a (third) syzygy with Valentinus (†160 on the island of Cyprus), "that most profound, spiritual, thoughtful, intelligent and imaginative" Gnostic (see Gieseler, *K. G.*, I., p. 155; particularly Kurtz, *K. G.*, I., 136, sqq.). Eternal, true, full life is only the Being of the Logos, as it is the Being of the Father. But this Life He has not only in Himself as a possession, as Jno. i. 4: ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, but He Himself was truly and altogether Life, eternal Life in His Being (v. 2), of the same Life-substance with God the Father, indissolubly united with Him, although different from Him in Person, there is nothing in Him which is not likewise in the Father, but He is self-dependent, turned to and belonging to the Father (πρὸς τὸν πατέρα).

2. Threefold is the *mode of existence* of the Logos: *a. anterior to the world* of time; *b. earthly-human*; *c. glorified.* The first is made prominent in the beginning of this Epistle: ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, the second is intimated in ἐφανερώθη, and in conjunction with the third in υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. For λόγος and υἱός are to be distinguished, so that the historical Christ is called *Son*, cf. vv. 1. 3 with Jno. i. 1. 14. But in reality it is the same Person. The incarnate Logos does not *become* the *Son of God*, and this designation is not so much of ethical as of metaphysical import. He is called and is the Son of God only because of the relation essential to His Person, and of His eternal and ante-temporal relation to God.

3. The *humanity* of the Logos is referred to with marked emphasis, in the terms ἀκούειν, ὁρᾶν, θεᾶσθαι, ψηλαφᾶν, vv. 1. 2. 3. The Son of Man has become audible, visible, sensible to the children of men. His being ἐφανερώθη to the disciples was only brought about by His human nature, but so that He really σὰρξ ἐγένετο and

ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (Jno. i. 14). He is perfect man. But His becoming man is not brought out as much by John as by the other Apostles with reference to His humiliation, because John recognized the Divine glory in the form of the Servant, the Divine attributes in the form of His human appearing, sought their traces with peculiar love, and found them with a jubilant soul. John was more concerned with what the Son of God brought with Him, His eternal Life which He had in Himself, than with what He did assume, human flesh and blood. The Apostle sees in all the epiphanies and exhibitions of the Incarnate One, in all the humiliations of His earthly-human Being and Life, the Love, the Wisdom and the Power of Christ; he follows their traces with ardent attachment, and he follows them not in vain. He bears more testimony to the κρύψις than the κένωσις, but also more to the Lutheran intermixture [German: Into-one-another—M.] of the Divine and the Human in Christ.—Traces of the transcendency and immanency of God may also be found and proved here, and how both have to be held fast together.

4. Christ is the eternal principle of the life of men and of the world in general; He is the Mediator of all the activity of the Father exerted with reference to the world. The thought expressed in the Epistle to the Hebrews by φέρων τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ is the fundamental pre-supposition of ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, κοινωνία μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as well as of ἵνα—πεπληρωμένη. John, by the use of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς—, which, as opposed to ἐν ἀρχῇ, Jno. i. 1, within the beginning, points as a definite sphere, and as opposed to κατ' ἀρχὰς (Heb. i. 10) along the beginnings, following the beginnings,—points, although fastened to a longer line, more than ἐξ ἀρχῆς, Jno. vi. 64, out of the beginning as out of a fountain, to a source of history after the beginning—intends to mark the power existing in eternity as present and real in time and the course of history. [The peculiarly involved and occasionally obscure style of Dr. Braune will tax the patience of the reader, as it does that of the translator, who tries his best to express B's meaning in idiomatic English. The last sentence was peculiarly difficult, but the use of dashes and other marks of punctuation will, it is hoped, enable the reader to catch the author's meaning.—M.]. But it must be remembered that the Apostle is more concerned with the life of individuals, of the Apostles and of Churches, than with that of the whole world. Still what holds good in the case of individual man, the microcosm, must also apply to the whole world, the macrocosm. Christ could not be the principle of salvation to individuals, unless He were potent and destined for the whole world. Because in the creation He is the Mediator of the beginning of the world's life (Jno. i. 3) so also in the redemption He is of course the Mediator of the consummation of the world's life. The earth requires no new suns, and mankind no other Saviour. The truth of Christ is the only and eternal truth for all nations and times. Christ is not a world-historical personage, like Alexander the Great, but the Living One that has the keys of hell and of death (Rev. i. 18).

4. VER. 3 indicates the relation of *Churchliness* and *Christianness*, of *Church-dom* and *Christianity*, [I am not altogether satisfied with these terms, but they express as nearly as possible the German words, *Kirchlichkeit*, the quality of being Church-like, *Christlichkeit*, the quality of being Christ-like, or Christian, *Kirchenthum*, the state, existence or establishment of the Church, and *Christenthum*, the religion taught by Christ.—M.] For ἡ κοινωνία μεθ' ἡμῶν, the fellowship of the Churches with the Apostles and among themselves is *Church*, while κοινωνία μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ denotes the nature of Christianity. John insists only on Church-fellowship for the promotion of Christianness. It is Apostolical that the Churches should keep to the Apostles and their annunciation, and be united among each other without independentism, but it is equally and only Apostolical that the Christ-like or the Christian-like should be the basis and aim of the Churchly. The Churchly must ever be measured and adjusted by the Christ-like.

5. The *Church* is a whole, an organization embracing heaven and earth in the Church militant and triumphant, and in the Church militant all the different local Churches (καὶ ὑμῖν, καὶ ὑμεῖς, v. 3), and all the Churches of all centuries (ἀπαγγέλλομεν) gathered by the Apostolical ministry in general, with its continuous activity (Lücke). What Paul says (1 Cor. iii. 9–11. 16; Eph. ii. 20 sq.; cf. 1 Peter ii. 5) of the Church, that it is a building of the temple of God founded on Christ the corner-stone, or a body of which Christ is the head (Eph. i. 22 sq.; v. 23; Col. i. 18), is here also present to the mind of John, who, with a leaning to John xv. 1, seems to think of a growth, in which the Church is the stem founded by Christ, out of which believers come forth on all sides like branches (John xvii. 20).

6. *The Apostolical annunciation*, ἀπαγγελία, presupposes an eventful experience from personal intercourse with the Redeemer, and is accompanied by the Apostolical writings (γράφομεν). All information derived from oral communication must be strengthened, guided, cleared and completed by the written communication. He only is able to work for the Lord and the brethren that has lived with Him in intimate converse, to whom He did yield Himself and whom he did draw to Himself, so that he "cannot but speak the things which he has seen and heard," (Acts iv. 19. 20).

7. *Joy* is the essence of Christianity. Augustine, *Conf.*, 10, 22, says: "*Est enim gaudium, quod non datur impiis, sed iis tantum, qui te gratis colunt, quorum gaudium tu ipse es. Et ipsa est beata vita gaudere ad te, de te, propter te, ipsa est et non altera.*"—The Christian faith does not move in a circle of different objects, thoughts, words and works, some of which must be done and others shunned; but it moves in that which it does gladly, and shuns that which it scorns to do. The Word and Life of Christ are as much the Christian's element as air is the element of birds, and water that of fishes. The exercises of godliness are to him not charms against an evil, or the worship of God a slave-work, or prayer a burden. The godliness, which is kindled by the loving-kindness of God is true happiness and

felicity. The fear of God does not bring to the Christian gloomy self-denial and renouncing of the world, as if the Christian's life consisted solely in the suppression of ardent desires and want, but in joys which he experiences, according to the exhortation of the Apostle Paul in the Epistle for the fourth Sunday in Advent (Phil. iv. 4): "*Rejoice in the Lord alway; and again I say rejoice.*" Or according to the Lord's promise in the Gospel for the third Sunday after Easter (John xvi. 22): "*Your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you.*" Hence the reiterated monition: "Be not afraid," and the promise of the Comforter and of peace. In the praise and love of God we have a token and a standard of true Christianity. Delight in the Lord (Ps. xxxvii. 4) with His creating, preserving, overruling, pardoning, atoning and glorifying (John iii. 2) love, is the Christian's duty and life. Only that he ABIDE, AND THE JOY OF CHRIST ABIDE IN HIM, AND THAT HIS JOY MAY BE FULL (John xv. 1-11).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Seek Jesus and His light; all without that is unprofitable.—Seek in all your experience in time for that which is from all eternity.—Seek in all sensuous manifestations for the supersensuous kernel with its life, which continues to all eternity, even as it is from all eternity.—Nothing is more sure than that which is of Christ: He is from all eternity, and brings His own into the Kingdom of the Father.—Learn more and more that God is not only above thee, but in the world, not far from thee, but very nigh thee.—Speak of Christ only as His witness. Speak of Him, because thou hast known and felt Him within thee, not because thou art a preacher or a theologian, or because thou art baptized.—Do not despise Church-fellowship; it contains a blessing, even an eternal blessing.—Be not satisfied with thy churchliness (churchmanship) unless it make thee more happy in, and more sure of the Father and the Son.—Christian knowledge, like all science, is possible only in fellowship with the whole, especially in going back to the fountain-head in the writings and the testimony of the Apostles.—Holiness and joy are indissolubly united in the Christian, but impiety and lust in the worldly-minded.—Be ashamed, if for want of faith or courage, or even because of a desponding mind, thou dost not rejoice in thy Lord.—Be afraid lest thy joy in Christ and the Kingdom of heaven decrease.—Strive that thy joy in Christ grow fuller and fuller. Delight in the Lord is thy duty, in order that thy duty become thy joy and honour, not thy task and burden.—A Christian must be joyful, for his is the truth which maketh free, the righteousness that availeth with God, the liberty of the children of God, the peace that passeth all understanding, the joy that no man may take away, the Divine sonship and inheritance, the life which death cannot kill, and the happiness which endureth and groweth forever.

STARKE:—Christ is Absolute Life, and our life depends upon Him, not only this earthly life, but also blessed, eternal life through faith in Him.—He that despises the word of the Gospel, despises also the Absolute Word of God, for Christ is the star and kernel of the whole Bible.—Christ liveth, and the believers shall live too. Glorious consolation! Mighty strengthening of our faith, in adversity and temptation and in the hour of death! Because Life and Light have appeared unto us in Christ Jesus, we should most diligently use them, for sure he will be without excuse that notwithstanding remaineth in darkness and blindness.—What shall it profit an unconverted teacher, to testify of Christ the Life, and to urge the people to receive Him, if he himself remains in death and in his life and by his works denies Him?—In order to be saved, it is not enough that a man know and believe Christ to have come into the world, but he must know and believe Him to have also risen and shone as the Morning-star in his heart.—The design of the Gospel is to lead men to fulness of joy, for God has not called us to sadness, but to joy.—If our joy turns sometimes into sorrow when affliction without and temptation within, as it were, threaten to take it by storm, we know, for our edification and comfort, that Christ will come again and turn our sorrow into joy. [Cf. Dr. Muhlenberg's hymn, "*I would not live alway.*"—M.]

SPENER:—Our life in Christ is eternal life, and out of (*extra*) Him there is no life; although hidden now, it shall be revealed hereafter.—The Divine word of the Gospel is given unto us for the purpose of restoring us to the fellowship with God, and it is therefore an inestimable benefit that it gives us not only the knowledge of certain truths, but actually bestows upon us the blessings which it announces.—The written Word of God is not less potent to produce faith than the preached word, and this Word the Apostles have left us as a legacy which may be heard and read at all times, and therefore we ought to consider the written Word as more sure and trusty than the declarations of men.

LANGE:—In spiritual matters every man should for himself examine and understand the truths of God, and not blindly believe the report of others, lest like a blind man he be led astray and miserably cheated.—All human fellowship should be so arranged and constituted that it do not oppose the fellowship with God. We should regard the Epistles of the Apostles as Epistles of God addressed to ourselves, and know that they are most surely addressed to us in order that we may become, as it were, living Epistles of God, known and read of all men.

BESSER:—There is no fellowship with the Head of the Church apart from the instrumentality of the joints of the Apostles. Those who are inserted in the edifice of the Church, rest upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, with Jesus Christ Himself as the chief corner-stone.—Out of infinite Love the Son of God became what we are, in order that He might give us power to become what He is; He became partaker of our nature, that we should become partakers of the Divine nature. (Irenæus.)

HEUBNER:—Christianity demands a solemn and deep contemplation wholly absorbed in Christ [or entering into Christ.—M.]; hasty and superficial looking and hurrying away is unprofitable; Christianity wants profound natures.—Christianity rests mainly on facts, as external revela-

tions of God, in order that thus the Godhead may become visible to the sensuous man [to our senses.—M.], without any injury being done to its dignity.—The Apostles as such eye-and-ear-witnesses are also most sure and reliable, and it is impossible that their account of so many facts, their harmonious and many-sided account, could have been fabricated or be spurious.—These Apostolical writings compensate us for that which we can no longer see with our own eyes. We have, moreover, the testimony of the Church for those facts, for without them it [the Church.—M.] could not have come into existence.—The vocation of the Apostles was most philanthropic and beneficent: the design of their testimony and of the preached Gospel in general, is to lead all men to the fellowship of the same life which was enjoyed by the Apostles. The Apostles did not wish to keep their life to themselves, but loved to communicate it. The true nature of life is its impulse, wherever it is, to pour itself into others. The Apostles were to the first Christians, and are still to all Christians, channels and conductors to the Life Eternal; without the Apostles we should have neither Christ nor Christianity. The Apostles conduct us to it. Those who reject the Apostles and their testimony, cannot reasonably continue to discourse of Christianity; they have only left to them a Christianity of their own making.—Holy Scripture is a standing monument of history that may not be interpolated; it remains a pure and ever-accessible fountain; oral delivery would have grown more and more unreliable, the memory would have lost much, and our delight in the enjoyment of the Gospel would have lessened.—The evangelical history the most sublime history: 1. We will convince ourselves of it, *it comes from God, continues in God, and leads us to God;* and, 2. Lay to heart the conclusions we draw: behold the poverty of those who despise and neglect it! Give more attention and diligence to it!

Christian joy is from its very nature the highest joy. For,

I. *a. Whence is it?* Of God, of heavenly origin. *b. What does it aim at?* The eternal salvation of our souls. *c. For whom does it exist?* For all in the same manner (without exception).

II. (Conditions on our part): *a. Acquire a thorough understanding* of the truth that sin is our common misery, and that none can save us therefrom but Jesus Christ alone. *b. Believe in Jesus,* the Son of God. *c. Animate this faith* by habits of devotion.

The Apostolical testimony of the Word of Life.—1. How it is attested (as to its verification); 2. How joyful it is (as to its *object:* the Life was *manifested,* and as to its *effects:* Fellowship of Christians among themselves and with God).

The firm foundation of our faith.—It rests, 1, *upon the Apostolical annunciation of the witnesses* of Him who is the Beginner, Fulfiller and Object of our faith (v. 1); 2, *on its joyful object* (contents, *German*) v. 2, which could not have spontaneously entered into any man's heart; 3, *on the testimony of the Holy Ghost* in those who receive the word of faith from the lips of the aforesaid witnesses.

SPURGEON:—It is indeed written (Prov. xiv. 10): "A stranger doth not intermeddle with his joy." The secret is with them that fear Him, and their joy no man taketh from them. But we would remind you of the proverb, "Still waters run deep." The brook rushing over the stones dries up in summer, but the deep river flows uniformly along in freshets, or in heat and drought, and yet glides calmly through the fields. We do not speak or boast so loudly of our joys, as you do of your pleasures, because it is unnecessary; ours are as well known in silence as in lively company. We do not want your company to indulge our joy, still less the manifold condiments with which you try to flavour your joy. We require no cups, no banquets, no fiddles, no dance in order to be joyful.—Our joy does not depend on transitory things, but rests in the eternal, unchangeable Creator of all things. I know very well, notwithstanding all we shall say, the slander will continue that the children of God are a wretched people.—We *have* joy, we *have* delights, so precious that we would not exchange an ounce of ours with a ship-load of yours; not drops of our delight for rivers of your pleasures. Our delight is not tinsel, painted joy, but solid reality; our joys are such as we take along with us to our quiet resting place beneath the dust; joys which sleep with us in the grave and will wake with us in eternity, joys on which we may courageously look back, and which, therefore, we enjoy a second time in memory; joys also which we enjoy beforehand, and know already here below as the antepast of eternal joy and delight. Our joys are no soap-bubbles which only glitter and sparkle in divers colours in order to burst, they are no apples of Sodom which crumble in your hand into ashes; true joys are real, true, solid, lasting, enduring, eternal! What more shall I say? Joy and true piety are eternally joined together like root and blossoms, as inseparably as truth and assurance; they are indeed two precious jewels, set side by side in the same gold setting."

[*Sermons and Sermon-Themes:*

CH. I. II. BINNING, HUGH: Fellowship with God, or twenty-eight sermons on the first and second chapters of the first Epistle of St. John. Works, II., 177.

VV. 1-3. MILL, W. H.: The Word Incarnate, the essential basis of individual and social Christianity. Sermons, (Advent, 1846), I.

VER. 3. *The same author:* The Word Incarnate in the totality of His exhibition in the Church, the true centre of Christianity. Sermons, (Advent, 1846), XXVIII.

BRADLEY, C.: Fellowship with God. Sacramental, 216.—M.]

II. PRINCIPAL PART THE FIRST.

Chapter I. 5–II. 28.

IF YE WALK IN THE LIGHT (I. 5–II. 2)—OBEDIENT TO HIS LAW IN GENERAL (II. 2–6), AND TO THE COMMANDMENT OF BROTHERLY LOVE IN PARTICULAR (II. 7–14), NOT MISLED BY THE LUSTS (II. 15–17) AND THE LIES OF THE WORLD (II. 18–23) YE SHALL ABIDE BEFORE CHRIST.

1. *Leading thought: God is Light.*

5 **This then is[1] the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you,[2] that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.**

[German:—And this is the message, which we have heard from Him, and announce you again, that God is Light and darkness in Him is none whatsoever.—M.]

Verse 5. [1] ἔστιν αὕτη, B. C. G. K., Cod. Sin., al. [Syr., Theoph., Oecumen., Tischend., Buttmann, Wordsw. καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶ, A., Vulg., Lachm., Rec.; this is altered from the original reading.—M.]

[2] Instead of ἀγγελία, A. B. G., al. [Griesb., Scholz., Lachm., Tischend., Wordsw.—M.] we find ἐπαγγελία in C., and in Cod. Sin., over ἀπαγγελία, the following correction, probably emanating from the transcriber himself: ἀγάπη τῆς ἐπαγγελίας; but a later hand has added ἀγγελία as the right reading.

[[3] ἀναγγέλλομεν, renuntiamus, announce again, report (Lillie). *Declare*, E. V., is too weak, it denotes a repetition of an announcement already made and known, brought out by the preposition ἀνα. See the notes of Bengel and Erasmus in *Exegetical and Critical*.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 5. **And** is not like οὖν (*igitur*, Beza) or δὲ (Episcopius); for it is neither an inference, nor even a delicate antithesis; it simply connects with the preceding, as does καὶ—γράφομεν, v. 4, with ἀπαγγέλλομεν, and while ταῦτα points to the contents of the now opening Epistle, καὶ connects with the exordium, in which preparation is made for what follows, and αὕτη ἡ ἀγγελία points to the subsequent words [ὅτι ὁ θεὸς κ. τ. λ.—M.].

This is the message.—Contrary to the usual position of the words (αὕτη ἐστίν, ch. ii. 25; iii. 11. 23; iv. 3; v. 11. 14, cf. Jno. xvii. 3), ἐστιν is emphatically placed first to denote the existence and reality of the message. The poorly authenticated reading ἐπαγγελία is very awkward, the word denoting not *annunciation* (Oecumen., Beza, de Wette contrary to the grammatical usage of the N. T.), either here or elsewhere (ch. ii. 24; iii. 11; cf. var. 2 Tim. i. 1; Acts xxiii. 21), and if taken in the sense of *promise* would have required here an enlargement of the thought. Calov: *non jubemur tantum in luce ambulare ac mundari sanguine Christi, sed utriusque etiam gratia nobis promittitur, illius per Spiritus Sancti illuminationem, hujus per expiationis Christi applicationem; quia utraque fruimur per beatam cum Deo et Christo communionem.* [Huther thinks that the reading ἐπαγγελία in the sense of *promise* might be justified on the ground that every announcement of the New Testament is fraught with promise, and cites Spener, who says: "*Promise*, as the sequel indeed conceals a promise. God is not only a light in Himself, but He is also the light of believers. And that is the promise."—M.].—ἀπαγγελία, which occurs no where in the New Testament, as Socinus and Episcopius read, is an arbitrary correction. The outwardly best authenticated reading is strongly supported by the context, for it seems to rëecho in the following ἀναγγέλλομεν: the message of Christ is announced *again* by His Apostles. Erasmus: "*Quod filius annunciavit a patre, hoc Apostolus acceptum a filio* RE*nunciat nobis.*"

Which we have heard from Him.—The Apostle alludes to v. 1. He thinks of the first disciples, and more particularly of the Apostles. Hence both the ἀγγελία, the ἀκηκόαμεν, and the contents of the message: ὁ θεὸς κ. τ. λ., suggest the reference to Jesus, the Christ; this is also rendered necessary by the preposition ἀπό, which indicates the Prophet-speaker, the Person of the Master, on whose lips the Apostles hang as hearers and disciples. John uses ἀκούειν παρά, ch. viii. 26. 40; xv. 15, but there it is the Father who speaks and the Son who hears; this (παρά) presupposes the nearness, the being together, and had to be used when the Son was hearing the Father, the other (ἀπό) denotes distance, and could hardly have been used in the aforecited passages; παρά points also to familiarity, ἀπό only to derivation in general. αὐτοῦ denotes, with reference to v. 3: τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, Christ; the assertion that αὐτοῦ, as distinguished from ἐκεῖνος, which always relates to Christ, invariably refers to the Father (Paulus, Baumgarten-Crusius) is incorrect. The sense then is: From Him, the Incarnate Son of God, whom we have heard, etc., v. 1, we have received the message concerning God the Father (Düsterdieck, Huther). Socinus, who takes the relation of God and Christ not as *conjunctio essentiæ*, but only as *conjunctio voluntatis et rerum aliarum omnium*, understands *a Deo et Christo, i. e., a Deo per Christum*, thus representing Christ as the mere mediator and not as the author of the message.

And announce to you again.—Next to the note of Erasmus, as quoted above, we cite the admirable exposition of Bengel: "*Quæ in ore Christi fuit* ἀγγελία *eam apostoli* ἀγγέλλουσι; *nam* ἀγγέλιαν *ab Ipso acceptam reddunt et propagant.*" ἀναγγέλλειν is not exactly=ἀπαγγέλλειν, the latter denotes *to continue announcing* [rather to bear tidings from one person (ἀπό) to another—M.],

the former to announce *anew, back, again*, as in Jno. iv. 25; xvi. 25, where, however, ἀπαγγελῶ is the more authentic reading. As our Lord conversed with the Syrophœnician woman as the Messenger of God REporting what the Father had told Him before, so the Apostles *report* what the Lord had told them before (Jno. xx. 21).

God is light.—This is the substance of the ἀγγελία. But Christ did not say so, although He called Himself *the Light*, Jno. xii. 12; xv. 46; and speaks of *the children of the Light* (Jno. viii. 36), even as James refers to the *Father of the Lights*, τῶν φώτων, Jas. i. 17, see the note above *ad loc.* But Christ, as the Son of God, is ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ (Heb. i. 2), and this it is which John and his fellow Apostles (v. 1) had heard, seen and gazed upon, so that the sum-total and centre of the message of Christ, as well as His personal manifestation and revelation in the flesh, may truly be expressed in the words "*God is Light.*" Christ reveals this, but no philosopher is able to find it; without Christ the wise men of the world pass it by. It is not *a* light, as Luther translates, as if there were other lights beside and out of Him. The Being of God is Light. Neither is it *in the light*, as if it were only surrounding Him, nor *as the Light.* It is not *secundum similitudinem* (Bullinger), but *secundum substantiam.* Light is His garment (Ps. civ. 2); Ezekiel (ch. i.) and Habakkuk (iii. 8, sqq.) beheld the glory of the Lord as fire, pure and bright as lightning. He is not only the *Author* of light, to whom belongs His first creative *fiat* (Gen. i. 3), but the *Father of all light* (Jas. i. 17), a mighty sphere of light surrounds Him (1 Tim. vi. 16); and the marvellous light wherein Christians walk is God's (1 Pet. ii. 9). This sentence is parallel to the sentence: "*God is Love*" (ch. iv. 8. 16), with the same fundamental thought, although in the one instance the expression is figurative, and in the other literal, and the figurative expression lays peculiar emphasis on one side of the Divine Being, and this, on account of the antithesis in the following verses (vv. 6–10), is also *holiness*, perfect pureness, but not omniscience, as Calov maintains, although in Dan. ii. 22 light is the symbol of the omniscience of God; it may include, however, the *wisdom* of God. [Alford:—"Of all material objects, light is that which most easily passes into an ethical predicative without even the process, in our thought, of interpretation. It unites in itself purity, and clearness, and beauty, and glory, as no other material object does; it is the condition of all material life and growth and joy. And the application to God of such a predicative requires no transference. He is Light, and the fountain of light material and ethical. In the one world, darkness is the absence of light; in the other, darkness, untruthfulness, deceit, falsehood, is the absence of God. They who are in communion with God, and walk with God, are the light, and walk in the light."—M.]

And darkness in Him is none whatsoever.—This second negative member, stated with marked emphasis (οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία, similar to John xv. 5, see Winer, p. 521. ["The two negations produce *one* negation, which is the more frequent case, and serve, originally, to make the principal negation more distinct and forcible, and exhibit the sentence as negative in all its parts."—M.]), rejects any and every darkness, *i. e.*, impureness [or absence of all admixture.—M.]. Oecumenius: ἤτοι τὴν ἄγνοιαν, ἢ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. Rather both: neither an untruth or a lie, nor any sin is in Him. The fulness of the reference contained in this expression is brought out by Lorinus in the following passage cited by Huther: "*Deus lux est, quia clarissime se ipsum percipit, omniaque in se ipse, utpote prima et ipsissima veritas; quia summe bonus, ac summa et ipsissima bonitas; fidelis absque ulla iniquitate, justus et rectus, quia fons omnis lucis in aliis, i. e., veritatis atque virtutis, non solum illustrans mentem, docensque quid agendum sit, verum etiam operans in nobis, ut agemus et sic radiis suis liberans mentem ab ignorantiæ tenebris, purgans a pravitate voluntatem.*"—John's speculation or mysticism is so thoroughly ethical, that he is solely concerned with the practical working out of the truth: "God is Light." As he connects this sentiment with the preceding by καί, namely, the fellowship with the Father and the Son, so he develops the nature of this fellowship-life in the sequel (v. 6–ii. 28). Now, since the nature of this fellowship and of the life in it depend upon the nature of the Father, he begins with the leading thought (v. 5) and with reference to errors in a sentence of two members, the one positive, the other negative. [Huther: "John properly makes the truth that God is Light, as the chief substance of the ἀγγελία of Christ, the starting-point of his development; for it is the essential basis of Christianity, both as to its objective and subjective substance, and it involves both the consummation of sin and the redemption from sin by the incarnation and death of Christ; both the necessity of repentance and faith and the moral problem of the Christian life."—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Monotheism and the absolute personal existence of God* are with John two chief points, which may be also identified here, although one side only is made prominent. Of the two sentences, "*God is Spirit*" (John iv. 24), and "*God is Love*" (1 John iv. 8. 16),—the former denoting the Being of God *physically*, the latter *ethically;* the former describing the nature and substance, the latter the character of God,—the second only will have to be connected with the sentence, "*God is Light,*" and thus be further defined by a metaphorical expression. *Spirit* and *Love* are indeed correlative fundamental ideas, since *Spirit* denotes "free self-glory in self-consciousness and spontaneity over a substantial fulness of real vital powers," and *Love* "free self-surrender with conscious and intentional conservation of the essential original determinateness both of oneself and of others" (Plitt). But the phrase "*God is Light,*" declares "the superiority of God to all sensuous wants" (Köstlin), the holiness of God, and thus defines further the character of God, His *Love*, and this as a *holy* Love, while it enables us to take the *Love of God* as contemplating also the communication of His Holiness. We may add, "God is—eternal Life" (v. 20) as a correlative, so that His Love as well as His Holiness are live. *There is* NO MANNER *of darkness in Him.* He is not a God

in process of being coming to Himself in the history of creation, the world or in the spirit of man, as Plato maintains: He is operative prior to all the ὕλη of Plato, or the *dark Urgrund* of Schelling, as a self-conscious, holy, loving and living God. Nor has sin, evil, its original beginning in Him, as was taught by the Gnostics in their doctrine of emanations. [Wordsworth: "A sentence opposed to the error of most of the Gnostics, who asserted the existence of *two hostile Deities*, one a God of *Light*, the other of *Darkness*. Irenæus I., 25. 28, ed Grabe. Theodoret, *Hæret., fab. prœm.* Epiphan., *Hæres*, XXVI., cf. Ittig. *Hæres*, p. 34; note in his Comment. on John i. 5; and Bp. Andrewes, III., pp. 371–376. Almost all the Gnostics adopted the theory of *dualism*, derived from the Magians, and afterwards developed by the Marcionites and Manichæans."—M.]

2. *God is Light*—must not be taken as a notice, a truth without reality, a reality without efficiency. As the sentence "*God is Spirit*" (John iv. 24) is immediately followed by "and those who worship Him, must worship Him in Spirit and in truth," so this sentence must be taken as a principle, the application of which is contained in the sequel. The sentence is through and through ethical and practical. John wants no science without practice. He does not allow an enlightenment of the mind without a corresponding bias and purifying of the will.

3. The question "*Whence comes sin, evil* into the world?" the Apostle here decides very distinctly in a negative form: *in no event from God.* Evil though *connate*, is not *co-created.*

4. Nothing must be taught or announced that does not rest upon or does not agree with the testimony of Christ. Those who pretend to know eternal truth which maketh free, different from Him, do not know it better, and are not servants, but adversaries and rebels.—It is at once *Apostolical* and *Protestant* to go back to the beginning of the Gospel in Christ. We are much more the Apostolical Church than the Church of Rome with its claims to Apostolicity.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

God is Light. 1. Whence do you know it? 2. What does it mean? 3. Whither does it point?—Whatever right and true views you may have of God the Father, you have them from Christ, no matter whether a messenger of salvation, a servant of the Church have announced them to you, whether they were told you by your mother or commended by the counsel of a friend, whether Christian hands brought them to you in the Bible, or the Holy Ghost excited them in your heart.—Nothing gladdens the hearts of men more than light; but how have they abused the Word and deprived it of its best part, and try to make it chime in with unholiness in thought, in word and in deed!—The world's light dazzles without illumining, shines without producing a spring with blossoms or an autumn with fruit.—The world's light may be useful, build you in this life bridges of honour, bring wreaths to artists and fame to the wise, make account of order in the land and in the streets, rejoice the heart in the social circle and refresh the mind, but also undermine and destroy the salvation of your soul. But it cannot carry a shine of consolation into the night of life, still less into the night of death; it cannot help the soul to find love and the life which death cannot destroy.—The world's light sets like the sun in the sky; but the Light which is God the Lord, shines through all the night of sin, of life, of death.—Try every light, whether God be in it.—If He, the Holy One, is absent, that light is no light worthy of the name, but a false light, a will-o'-the-wisp.—Do not look for salvation in any light of science or civilization, if it denies the holy light. Fear only the darkness in which God the Father is not found.

STARKE:—Teachers should not pronounce any thing in things Divine but that which they have heard from the Lord in His Word; for if the Apostles themselves were firmly tied by it, how much more are they bound to cleave to it? The thoughts of man, being fallible, are not sufficient for the foundation of the faith.—Because God is Light, and in Him is no darkness whatsoever, it is wholly impossible that He can be the Cause of sin, which is the greatest darkness.—God is all Light, Wisdom, Holiness, Consolation and Joy; who would not desire to be united with Him?

LANGE:—Because God is Light we have often to sigh in our fellowship with Him: "Lord, cause Thy face to shine upon us, and be gracious unto us."

SPENER:—God is Light. 1. Holiness and Righteousness, showing that He not only has no evil within Himself, but also cannot suffer sin or evil in His creatures. 2. All wisdom and All-wisdom. 3. Glory and salvation.

HEUBNER:—Christianity has showed to all men the light-nature of God in Christ in the clearest brightness; that He is through and through perfect Knowledge, Omniscience, Wisdom, Love, Grace, Holiness and Happiness, and delights in the happiness of His creatures. Why does John specify this as the chief announcement? 1. Because it is of the first importance and indispensably necessary for sinful man to know that it is not by the hostile and malicious purpose of an omnipotent Being that he has been cast into this misery, that God did not plan his ruin, and that it does not come from Him, because He is pure and good. 2. Because salvation, a restoration of happiness may be expected from this God who desires all men to be happy. This belief is man's first support [holding-point] of salvation. And this His Will God has proved most strongly in fact—through Christ.

BESSER:—John convicts of falsehood three classes of spirits by declaring the vanity of the boast of fellowship with God on the part of such as walk in darkness instead of walking in the Light, of such as comfort themselves with the assurance of being perfectly pure instead of relying upon the continual cleansing of the blood of Christ, and lastly, of such as, instead of confessing their sins, deny their sinfulness. Worldly-mindedness, boast of sanctity and self-righteousness are exposed by John to the condemnatory light of the truth, and accompanied by an exhortation to a sincere, humble and penitent walking in the Light.

[BP. HALL:—*Divine Light and reflections.* Sermons, Works, 5, 419.—M].

2. *First Inference: The True Fellowship.*

CHAPTER I. 6–7.

6 If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness,[1] we lie, and do not
7 the truth: But if we walk in the light, as he[2] is in the light, we have fellowship one
with another,[3] and the blood of Jesus[4] Christ his Son cleanseth[5] us from all sin.[6] [7]

Verse 6. [[1] ἐν τῷ σκότει, in the darkness; so German, Lillie, al., Dutch, Ital., French verss.—M.]
Verse 7. [[2] ὡς αὐτὸς ἐστιν, as He Himself is, etc.; so Meyer, Lillie, Wordsworth, al. Winer: "Among the Greeks, as is well known, αὐτός in the *casus rectus* does not stand for the mere unemphatic *he*, nor could any decisive examples of this be found in the N. T."—M.]
[3] μετ' ἀλλήλων. The best Codd., also Sinait., have this reading; μετ' αὐτοῦ is substituted chiefly by Latin Codd., but the less authentic reading, and clearly a correction designed to conform v. 7 to v. 6.
[4] After Ἰησοῦ A. G. K., al. read Χριστοῦ, probably on account of v. 3. [It is omitted by B. C., Sin., al., Lachm., Tischend., Buttm.—M.]
[5] καθαρίσει or καθαριεῖ lacks sufficient authority.
[[6] Sin. reads ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.—M.]
[[7] German of the last clause:—"and the blood of Jesus, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The sequence is clear: the Apostle concludes from the Being of God the nature of their life who are and live in fellowship with God. He postulates that spiritual fellowship necessitates an affinity among persons in fellowship with one another, and that this internal fellowship must manifest itself externally in their life, so that fellowship with God is impossible without a corresponding godlike life as exhibited in the walk and conversation of men.

VER. 6. The *negative* part of the inference stands first, connecting with the last clause of the preceding verse ("and darkness in Him is none whatsoever").

If we say.—John is very fond of this phrase, vv. 7. 8. 9. 10; ii. 1; iv. 12; it is similar to ἐάν τις, ch. ii. 1. 15; iv. 20, or ὃς ἄν, ch. iii. 17; iv. 15. As to the sense, the following phrases present parallels: πᾶς ὁ ἔχων, ch. iii. 3; πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν, ch. iii. 4; πᾶς ὁ μένων, ch. iii. 6; πᾶς ὁ ἀρνούμενος, ch. ii. 23; without πᾶς, ch. ii. 4. 6. 9. 10. The Apostle is thus wont to describe an *objective* possibility (Winer, p. 308), *i. e.*, he assumes that it may be so, and that the event would show whether it will be so. The Apostle renders this hypothesis general by the use of the communicative Plural, and thus makes his speech more lively; if we,—not excluding myself and the Apostles, beginning with myself down to the most humble reader of this Epistle, or to any individual Church-member,—should say. Thus John combines in the communicative and hypothetical form generality of application and considerate delicacy (Lücke). *Saying* does not denote here the inaudible language of the heart, that is *thinking*, but articulate utterance and assertion induced by the force of conviction. But it is not on that account *nos gerere* (Episcopius), as if the reference were to a testimony of our walk and practical conduct, although this saying and alleging must be taken as equivalent to an act, a fact or an action. [Wordsworth suggests that ἐὰν εἴπωμεν contains a reference to the *saying* of the Gnostics, who alleged that by reason of the *spiritual seed* in them, and of their superior *spiritual knowledge*, and communion with the light, they were free to act as they chose, and were not polluted thereby, and were not guilty of sin (Irenæus, I., 6, 20). Some of them even ventured to extol the workers of the most audacious acts of darkness, such as Cain, Korah and Judas, as persons gifted with superior freedom of thought and intrepidity of action, and to affirm that, since the soul could not attain unto perfection except by *knowledge*, it was even requisite for men to make themselves familiar with all manner of evil, in order that by a universal empiricism of evil they might arrive the sooner at their ultimate consummation. See Irenæus, I., 25, 4, ed. Stieren; p. 103, ed. Grabe; II., 32, ed. Stieren; p. 187, ed. Grabe, and cf. Blunt on the Heresies of the Apostolic Age, *Lectures*, ch. IX., p. 179.—M.]

That we have fellowship with Him.—See the notes on v. 3. Here the Father only is mentioned, of whom it was said above that He is Light, in order to draw therefrom a conclusion bearing on the nature of the Christian life. [Fellowship with God is the centre and foundation of the Christian life.—M.]

And walk in the darkness.—*And* combined with *say* makes one sentence. — *Walk*, περιπατεῖν, ch. ii. 6; 2 Jno. 6, occurs also Rom. vi. 4; viii. 4; its synonymes are πολίτευμα, Phil. iii. 20, ἀναστροφή and ἀναστρέφειν, Eph. iv. 17, sq., ii. 2, sq.—Bengel: "*actione interna et externa, quoquo nos vertimus.*" It embraces all our actions, not only those perceptible to men (Ebrard), but also that on which these depend, whereby they are caused, the inward actions of our life.

In the darkness indicates the sphere and element in which that walking takes place, cf. Jno. viii. 12. Darkness, which is not at all in God, does not in any way belong to Him, is the undivine, the unholy, that which is separate from Him—sin, evil. It is therefore not: to have still adhering to one sin or evil, or failure and falling through haste or weakness in temptation, in the struggle; but as the *walk* does not denote gross and common sin only, so *walking in the darkness* does not imply the presence of satisfaction with sin, or the entire passing through the whole territory of sin in all directions; the reference must be to one particular phase of life; some want to be Christians and make good their profession in

every thing except honour; others are not severe with themselves or unfaithful to God and His Word in matters of worldly possession or in some master-passions, although in other respects they are strict and faithful. Such men walk, nevertheless, in the darkness, and the words "**we lie**" apply also to them. It is a contradiction and opposition, cf. 2 Cor. vi. 14, sqq. Not exactly intentional lying and conscious hypocrisy, but actual contradiction between Christian principle and the Christian sphere of life, and the real exhibition of life, certainly not without personal guilt; it is our guilt and our sin, *our own lie, we ourselves* are liars. Whenever, under those circumstances, we say that we have fellowship with Him, we lie; we lie to ourselves, if we say it only within ourselves, in our heart, think or imagine it, or we lie to others, if we say it to them in our words or our works. Such lying consists, therefore, in thoughts, words and deeds.

And do not the truth.—This is not the same as ψεύδεσθαι, as if ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν were identical with ἀληθεύειν, Eph. iv. 15. It is neither the same as *agere recte* (Socinus), nor *sincere* (Beza, Grotius, Carpzovius), nor *veraciter* (Calvin). The truth consists not only in words, but also in thoughts and deeds; its sphere embraces the whole life, the whole man. The truth, according to John's view, must be *done;* saying with him implies acting; not to do the truth is here parallel with walking in the darkness, while to do the truth corresponds to walking in the Light. "It is one and the same truth, which is apprehended in faith and confessed with the mouth, which, as a holy, Divine power, recreates the life of the new man and manifests itself in internal and external deeds." (Düsterdieck), cf. Jno iii. 19–21 [where ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν is opposed to φαῦλα πράσσειν, and where special reference is made to the ἔργα.—M.]—Thus the Apostle raises his powerful protest against every form of show-, word- or lip-Christianity, but his reference is to Christians, and therefore he passes on to Ver. 7, to the *positive* part of the inference.

But if we walk in the Light.—δὲ marks an antithesis. *In the Light* is explained by the antithesis ἐν σκότει, and by the additional clause, **as He is in the Light,** with reference to v. 5. [But this, it seems, is not the only antithesis, for it is also antithetical to ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, ὅτι κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' αὐτοῦ, v. 6, viz.: if we not only *say* that we have fellowship with God and not walk in the darkness, but if we *really* walk in the Light; so Huther, Ebrard.—M.].—Our walk in the light embraces, therefore, the holiness of our inner and outer life, a holiness which in its consequences operates a communion among the brethren, and fully corresponding to the Light-Being of God, which is also Love, exhibits its essential strength in the formation and preservation of fellowship. *As He is in the Light* is only formally different from *God is Light;* the latter phrase denotes Light as the Being of God, the former designates the element in which He is and lives.—ὡς indicates the oneness of element [in which Christians walk and God lives and moves—M.] and ground in God and ourselves; His holiness must be traceable in us if we have fellowship with Him. He indeed *is* in the Light, while we *walk* in the light, it matters not how poor and defective our efforts may be. The sense is very similar to 1 Pet. i. 14–16; 2 Pet. i. 4. [Cf. ἐστι and περιπατῶμεν. God is infinite—man finite.—M.]

We have fellowship one with another.—The reading μετ' αὐτοῦ cannot be right; for to walk in the Light and to have fellowship with Him coincide. But we naturally expect an advance in the argument. It is, therefore, not right to take μετ' ἀλλήλων as ἡμῶν τε καὶ τοῦ φωτός (Theophrast., Oecumen.), especially because God and men, the Creator and His creatures, are not of sufficient equality to be comprised in μετ' ἀλλήλων. Equally inadmissible is the construction of Beza (*cum illo mutuam communionem*), and that of de Wette, who renders *our fellowship with God.* It is the fellowship of Christians one with another, as v. 8, μετ' ἡμῶν, cf. iii. 11; iv. 7. 11. 12. To *have* (see note on v. 8) and to *keep* this fellowship is not a light matter; it is the fruit of the walking in the Light, of the fellowship with God, of a holy life and of holy aspirations. For sin separates, impedes and constantly destroys that fellowship. [This passage shows that the fellowship of Christians, or the "communion of Saints," as it is expressed in the Apostles' Creed, rests on a truly *Catholic basis,* and that its restriction to the narrow limits of a sect is at once un-evangelical, un-Apostolic and un-Christian.—M.] Hence the Apostle continues:

And the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us.—The copula καὶ establishes a parallel with the preceding words, and points consequently not to fellowship with God and the brethren to be established, but to a fellowship already existing, and so well established that the first, viz.: fellowship with God, has already yielded the fruit of the second, viz.: fellowship with the brethren. It is impossible to take and interpret καὶ=γὰρ, as alleged by Oecumen., Bede, Calov, Semler, al. The question is not to supply *proof* of the fellowship with the brethren, but to state a *consequence* of walking in the Light. The only question is whether the cleansing through the blood of Christ takes place *alongside* or *inside* the fellowship of the brethren with one another. The work of redemption is a *whole,* and not mechanical, but organic and moral, so that this cleansing takes place *inside* the fellowship of the Church, of the fellowship essential to and established for redemption. Exegetically important is, moreover, the *meaning* and the *Present form* of καθαρίζει. This word cannot be the same as ἀφιέναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας, because it recurs, v. 9, by the side of and after that phrase. The reference is, therefore, not to the remission of sins, to exemption from punishment or the pardon of guilt, but to the cancelling of sin and redemption from it. The Apostle does not advert here to justification, regeneration, conversion, the *actus judicialis* or *forensis* concerning the sinner, but to *sanctification.* The Present may suggest the idea of daily repentance and forgiveness of sins, but the meaning of the verb forbids also this reference. But wherein that *cleansing* consists is defined by the cleansing subject: **the blood of Jesus His Son.** It is said αἷμα, consequently not: God's new covenant with us established by the blood of Christ (Socinus), not: our faith in the sufferings of Christ (Grotius), not: Jesus Christ

who shed His blood for us, not: the contemplation of the death of Jesus (Paulus), not: the reasonable belief of the moral end of the crucifixion of Jesus (Oertel); τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ is the blood shed upon the cross, the bloody death of Jesus on the cross, as in ch. v. 6, sqq. [The blood which Jesus, so-called because of His incarnation, shed as a sacrifice at His Crucifixion, or the bloody sacrificial death of Jesus, so Huther, Düsterdieck, Ebrard.—M.]. This indicates the historical fact when the man Jesus died upon the cross at Golgotha, the sufferings of the Lord when He made experience of the sins of men, suffered for them, carried them also, assumed them (ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων, etc., Jno. i. 29), and took them away as Reconciler, but takes them away also as our Saviour, having died *for* us, but now lives and works *in* us, cf. ch. iii. 5. [Wordsworth: "No less a sacrifice than the death of the *Son of God* was required to *propitiate* the offended justice of God for sin; and no less a price than His *blood*, to ransom us from the bondage of Satan, to which we were reduced by sin."—M.]. The addition of τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ points to His relation to God the Father, consequently to His Divinity, where two things are to be considered, first, the exaltation and glory, secondly, the humiliation and servant-form of the Crucified One; the blood of the God-Man is the subject which cleanses. Now the death of Jesus is a sacrificial death, His blood sacrificial blood, shed for the atonement of committed guilt, for reconciling the offended majesty of God and the inimically disinclined sinner, a ransom for mankind doomed to death and condemnation. See ch. ii. 2; iii. 5; iv. 9; v. 6, sqq. He creates to believers justification before God, but the power that creates preserves also that which it creates. The redeemed congregate at the cross of Jesus; sin is forgiven, the debt remitted, sin must now be cancelled and fresh guilt avoided; in believers *peccatum manet* but *non regnat*. Thus in the Church congregated at the cross and preserved in unity, sanctification continues in operation, after having begun its operativeness in justification. It is not our walking in the Light, not our own efforts in sanctification, but the blood of Jesus which cleanses us. (See *Doctrinal and Ethical*, No. 8).

[The whole doctrine of this verse is very fully and admirably set forth in Düsterdieck. The sum of what he says we give in the language of Alford: "St. John, in accord with the other Apostles, sets forth the Death and Blood of Christ in two different aspects:

1. As the one sin-offering for the world, in which sense we are justified by the application of the blood of Christ by faith, His satisfaction being imputed to us.

2. As a victory over sin itself, His blood being the purifying medium, whereby we gradually, being already justified, become pure and clean from all sin. And this application of Christ's blood is made by the Spirit which dwelleth in us.

The former of these asserts the imputed righteousness of Christ put on us in justification: the latter, the inherent righteousness of Christ wrought in us gradually in sanctification. And it is of this latter that he is here treating."—M.]

From all sin—whether sins of thought, word or deed, sins of rashness or sins of ignorance, sins of malice, sins of omission or sins of commission, sins in *affectu* or sins in *defectu*, sins of pleasure or sins of pain, sins committed at our work or during our recreation, sins against the first or the second table of the decalogue. Bengel: *originale, actuale*.

[Wordsworth notices the completeness of this doctrinal statement, which declares that *Jesus* is the *Christ*, against the Cerinthians (but this rests on the doubtful reading χριστοῦ, see App. Crit., v. 7, 4), that He is the *Son of God*, against the Ebionites, that He shed His *blood* on the cross, against the Simonians and Docetæ, that it *cleanseth from all sin*, against those who deny pardon on earth to deadly sin after baptism, and that it cleanseth us if *we walk in the Light*, against the Antinomian Gnostics, who changed the *grace* of God into *lasciviousness* (Jude 4), and alleged that a man might *walk in darkness* and yet be clean from all guilt of sin.—M.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *As He is in the Light*, v. 7—is not a Gnostic dogma simply required to be known and understood, but an ethical principle for the governance of our walk. Light, as it is the Being of God (v. 5), so it is also the element of God, and because it is the Being of God, therefore it is also His element, wherein He dwells and lives. Light must become our element in order that it may also become our Being; we must live in Him that He may more fully live in us, for we are destined to *become* θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 4. To *strive* after resemblance of God (Lücke) is saying too little. Nor is Bengel altogether right in saying: "*imitatio Dei criterium communionis cum Illo.*" For if the Lord says (Matt. v. 48): "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (cf. Lke. vi. 36), perfection or compassion is not set down as a foreign and distant goal, or held up as an ideal rule, but the experience and enjoyment of the perfect compassion of God is to become an impulse for receiving and appropriating it, in order that we, in our turn, may exhibit it. 1 Pet. i. 15. 16 is similar. Even Paul says (Eph. v. 1): γίνεσθαι οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά. As children they are in their converse with the Father to inhale and receive what they experience at His hands, in order that they may have within themselves a living fountain, causing in its turn the streaming forth of Divine life, and to do as the Father doeth. The reference is not to an artificial imitation, but to a filial following the Father in ardent attachment to Him. The child is not so much literally to imitate as to cleave to the Father, to receive Him, and as the Lord so often requires it, to *follow* Him. Such a life in converse with God, in the life-sphere of God, John emphatically demands as the chief requirement of individual Christians, as well as of the whole Church.

2. *The Person of Jesus* is again taken as uniting the Godhead and Manhood, when His blood is spoken of as αἷμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (of God). The word αἷμα testifies against Docetism, because it is operative as a real power, and against Ebionism the words "His Son," whose the blood is: the

Godhead, in brief, is a factor in the work of redemption. This combined expression opposes as much Nestorianism, which separates the two natures, as Eutychianism, which confounds them, and testifies for the Lutheran doctrine with its *communicatio idiomatum*, and against the Reformed principle: *finitum non capax infiniti*. Luther, in his Confession of Faith, A. D. 1528–29 (Guericke: *Symbolik*, p. 666), says: "Again I believe and know that the Scripture teaches, that - - God the Son - - did assume a whole, full humanity, and was the true seed or child promised to Abraham and David, and was born as the natural son of Mary, every way and in every form a true man, as I am myself and all others; but that He came without sin, of the Virgin alone, by the Holy Ghost. And that this man is truly God, and became (other reading: was born) one inseparable Person of God and man, so that Mary the holy Virgin is a very and true mother not only of the man Christ, as the Nestorians do teach, but of the *Son of God*." But if Luther in a Trinity Sermon (Erlangen edit., 9, p. 25), on the ground of Acts xx. 28, calls the blood of Christ straightway *the blood of God*, it is to be borne in mind that in that passage κυρίου and not θεοῦ is the best authenticated reading, and that such an *oxymoron* must not be pressed beyond seeing in it the doctrine of the inseparable God-Man. Calov's following Luther cannot be regarded as a precedent of great moment, since the Scripture, with its wisdom in the choice of terms, does not require us so to do.—Cf. *Doctrinal and Ethical*, on v. 3, No. 3. [Also the last note on v. 7, in *Exegetical and Critical*.—M.]

[Article II. of the 39 Articles of the Church of England and the Prot. Episc. Church in the U. S. states thus briefly the doctrine of the Person of Christ: "The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men." And the *Athanasian Creed*, vv. 28–35, thus defines:

28. *Est ergo Fides recta, ut credamur et confiteamur, quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Deus pariter et Homo est.*

29. *Deus ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus: Homo, ex substantia Matris in sæcula natus.*

30. *Perfectus Deus, perfectus Homo ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.*

31. *Æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem: minor Patre secundum Humanitatem.*

32. *Qui licet Deus sit et Homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus.*

33. *Unus autem, non conversione Divinitatis in carnem, sed assumptione Humanitatis in Deum.*

34. *Unus omnino, non confusione Substantiæ, sed unitate Personæ.*

35. *Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est Homo; ita Deus et Homo unus est Christus.*"—M.]

3. The work of Jesus is strongly characterized in one direction: "*His blood cleanseth from all sin.*" This statement involves the following particulars:

1. We can nevermore cleanse ourselves, our cleansing remains the work of Christ.

2. It is just the death of Christ that effects and accomplishes our cleansing; dying for sin, He conquers it; the victory of sin is its defeat, and the defeat of Christ is His victory: fighting unto death, He acquires the life of His own, and sin in its triumph over Him on the cross is discomfited. For His sake God turns to the world His reconciled countenance, and through faith in the Crucified One the world abandons sin, which is enmity against God. The cross, the death upon the cross, possesses an overwhelming power of attraction, and the life of the Son of God shut up in the life of the body breaks through in the life of the Spirit, in the working of the Spirit sent by Him and the Father, who now becomes operative in believers (Jno. vii. 39; Col. xvi. 7; Acts ii. 33).

3. Sin still cleaves to the justified; justification does not miraculously or magically cancel sin by a judicial decree, it only absolves us from punishment, guilt and condemnation, but requires the carrying on of the work of redemption (of which it is the beginning), and of its consummation in sanctification; justification does not end, but it does begin redemption.

4. Justification does not even effect the independence of the believer, but merely introduces him into the walk in Light, to the fellowship of the brethren one with another, as into the sphere within which redemption may be carried on and consummated, and also in the individual; redemption, like the knowledge of infinite Love, is a common experience (Eph. iii. 18, sq., σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις).

5. Sanctification is the continuation of justification, it must ever return to it and recur to its power and might.

6. Sanctification is a work gradual in its growth.

7. It has respect to *all* sin, not only to its manifestation, but to its seat and origin.

8. Justification and sanctification, the power of the death upon the cross and the fellowship with the brethren, the walk in the Light and the cleansing from all sin, all these reciprocally operate on and promote each other; this holds more particularly good of brotherly, of Church-fellowship, and of the hallowing power of the Saviour's death upon the cross, so that we are reminded of the words of Cicero: "*Nisi in bonis amicitia esse non potest.*" Or, we must distinguish, but not separate Christ *for* us, *before* us, and *in* us.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Every thing depends on the reply you give to the question whether sin rules you or as yet only adheres to you. If sin reigns over you, you belong as yet to the darkness, but if the reign of sin is broken in you, though there be still sin in you, you belong to the children of light.—It is not with pride, but with gratitude to God, that the Christian contemplates his being in the light.

—Love of God and of the brethren is the power of sanctification, and this is the life of love.—It is just the sanctified who see even the smallest sins with painfulness and perceive that they stand in need of cleansing through Jesus Christ. —If thy sin troubles thee in its deep motions, know that in the cross thou hast a well, whence thou mayest and must draw consolation. It is not sufficient that thou art a Christian who is *shone upon*, thou must become an enlightened Christian.

STARKE:—The ungodly are children of darkness without admitting it, they walk in the darkness without perceiving it, they commit the works of darkness without believing it. O, terrible blindness! Lord, open thou their eyes that they may see, tremble and return from their evil way.—How busy are people during the natural day! O, that they would not suffer the acceptable time and the day of salvation to pass by idly and without profit! Walk in the Light!—The virtue of the blood of Jesus Christ effects not only our first cleansing from dead works, but also our daily cleansing.

SPENER:—We may say it and glory that we have fellowship with God; nor is it spiritual pride to acknowledge the grace of God which we have received, provided we do not ascribe it to ourselves.—Light is impatient of darkness, and God of sin. By this test thyself, whether thou art God's. Moses shone beautifully through long converse with this light; why should not the soul wherein He dwelleth do likewise? Let thy light shine, and do not deceive thyself by false conceits.

NEANDER:—To those who sincerely strive to walk in the Light, yet make daily experience of the still remaining influence of sin, and are disquieted in their conscience on hearing that fellowship with God, who is Light, can only be had by those who walk in the light,—to such is offered the comfortable assurance of entire cleansing from the sin as yet adhering to them. But the self-deception of those is also met, who trust to cleansing through the blood of Christ, without a corresponding course of life. The close connection between Christ *in* us and Christ *for* us is here indicated.

HEUBNER:—Only among the pure is fellowship, *i. e.*, true concord, love, confluence of the hearts. Evil separates, and is the source of discord.—The kingdom of God is the kingdom of love and peace; that of Satan the kingdom of discord.

AHLFELD:—Which are the seals and evidences of true fellowship with God? 1. That we walk in the light; 2. that we have fellowship one with another; 3. the humble confession that we owe the cleansing from our sins solely to the blood of Jesus Christ.—Providence moves *pari passu* from the first creative fiat to the last judgment.—Thou knowest that every transgression enshrouds thy heart in night.—True fellowship does not flow from our natural life, not from leagues for the commission of common sin, not from common pleasure or common profit, but only from the walk in Light.—First *His* passion, then *thy* passion; first *His* dying, then *thy* dying.—As long as *Christ is our Righteousness, you also must go with Him into the walk in Light. As long as He is truly your Surety and Sacrifice*, you also must with Him present to God your heart and will as a sacrifice of sweet savour. *But he that learns to sacrifice himself, remains also in the fellowship with the brethren.*

BESSER:—But how many, who, perchance, do not know the school-name of the modern Nicolaitanes, the Pantheists, yet do their works, while from the fear of a separateness from sin, grievous to the flesh, they change the frontier-line between good and evil, put light for darkness and darkness for light, and then spread a figment of their own thoughts, which they call God, as a pillow for their worldly-mindedness.—Our fellowship with *God*, whom we do not see, is evidenced by our fellowship *with one another*, where one sees the other.—There are also will-o'-the-wisp-fellowships, and the mere *saying* of any Church-fellowship that it has fellowship with God is not sufficient.—Anna, the electress of Brandenburg, ordained in her will: "Our text shall be 1 Jno. i. 7: The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin."

STEINHOFER:—"A soul washed in the blood of Jesus Christ has very delicate perceptions. The light which has risen in her shows her the smallest dust-particle of sin and the most subtle motions of the flesh, and makes her perceive whatever accords with her happy frame in gladsome converse with God and the Saviour, and whatever disturbs it."

[RIEGER:—The Bible-verse of the blood of Jesus Christ and its cleansing virtue is a verse for the children of God, for the children of the Light, and says to them: your love of the light, your hatred of darkness with its unfruitful works were insufficient to warrant your access to God, your joyous appeal to His Love; with these only your approach of the Light would have caused you to melt away as wax exposed to the heat of fire; but it is *the blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God*, that is, God's sending His Son into the world to make atonement for your sins, whatever He did and suffered, especially His sacrificial blood-shedding in the voluntary surrender of Himself, and His present priestly appearance before the face of God with His blood and the treasure of all His merits contained therein, it is this which must be of avail to you. The design of this blood-shedding was *the cleansing of your sins;* and thus we find it declared in the Gospel, for our use in penitence and faith; thus it was sprinkled over us in Holy Baptism; and thus the Holy Ghost applies it in our daily renovation, bestowing upon us the double benefit of the forgiveness of our sins and the cleansing from all unrighteousness. At every motion of sin in our conscience or in our members, we may, under the influence of the Spirit, apply to this blood and its cleansing virtue, and thus prevent the calling into question or the sundering of our fellowship with God, and that in the power of the power of the high-priesthood of Christ we may ever become and remain nearer to God."—M.]

[BP. HALL:—As He is Light, so every aberration from Him is darkness; if we then say that we have fellowship with this pure and holy God, and yet walk in the darkness of any sin whatso-

ever, we belie ourselves, and do not according to that truth which we profess.—M.]

[*Sermons*:—

GRIFFITH, M.:—The spiritual antidote to cure our sinful souls.

CHARNOCK, STEPHEN:—The virtues of the blood of Christ.

EARLE:—The Popish doctrine of purgatory repugnant to the Scripture account of remission through the blood of Christ.—M.]

---

3. *Second Inference.—Perception and Confession of Sins.*

CHAPTER I. 8–10.

8 **If we say that we have no[1] sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.[2]**
9 **If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just[3] to forgive us *our* sins,[4] and to cleanse[5]**
10 **us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar,**
and his word is not in us.

Verse 8. [[1] German: "If we say that we have *not* sin," but the rendering of E. V. is better and idiomatically more correct, for ἁμαρτίαν ἔχειν is to have sin, and ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχειν denotes to have *no* sin, to be absolutely free from it.—M.]

[2] ἐν ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔστιν A. C. K. al. [Lachm., Tischend., Wordsw.—M.] is a more authentic reading than οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν B. G. al. Sin. Vulg.; which is probably a correction according to v. 10.

Verse 9. [[3] German: "He is faithful and *righteous* to forgive us *the* sins." δίκαιος "occurs other five times in this Epistle, and is always in E. V. so rendered. The opposition, moreover, between God as δίκαιος and the ἀδικία from which the Church is cleansed, is lost in E. V." Lillie.—The omission of *our*, supplied in E. V., is idiomatic German, but hardly English.—M.]

[4] ἡμῶν, *Cod. Sin.*, but otherwise feebly sustained, is probably added from the first clause of the verse.

[5] καθαρίσει A. al. [perhaps also in C**] cannot be received as the original reading. καθαρίσῃ has the the weightier authority of Sin. B.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection.—The structure of these verses is unmistakably the same as that of those immediately preceding them: negative (v. 8) and positive (v. 9), while the negation (v. 8) is continued (v. 10) with reference to the positive (v. 9), and the parallel is even indicated in the form: ἐὰν εἴπωμεν. vv. 8. 10. The connection of v. 8 with the presuppositions at the end of v. 7 (καθαρίσει ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας) that sin is still inhering in us, is equally unmistakable. But it is just as unmistakable that the *perception and confession of sins* are here emphatically dwelt upon as following and accompanying the true fellowship with its walk in the Light. The continuance of the Plural form (*we, us, our*) denotes also the general character both of what is said here and in the preceding verses. After all, we have here a second inference drawn from the leading thought that "*God is Light*," (v. 5).

VER. 8. *Perception of Sin.*—**If we say,** cf. v. 6, above in *Exegetical and Critical.*

That we have no sin.—Ἁμαρτία in the Singular denotes sin in general; the absence of the Article points out that the reference is neither to a particular sin, nor to the whole, full sin [but to *any* sin.—M.]. Hence the application of the term to original sin as contrasted with actual sins (*peccata actualia*), as maintained by Augustine, Bede, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Calov, Baumgarten-Crusius, Neander, Sander and Düsterdieck, is as inadmissible as that which refers it to a particular sin or a particular kind of sins, as in ch. v. 16; ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον, or μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, sins of infirmity, light offences, against which so early a writer as Augustine remarks: "*Multa levia* (*peccata*) *faciunt unum grande.*" Nor can ἁμαρτία designate the *guilt* of sin, as held by Socinus, Episcopius, Löffler and Grotius, the latter saying: "*Habere peccatum non est: nunc in peccato esse, sed: ob peccata reum posse fieri,*" nor describe sins committed or inhering anterior to entrance into fellowship with God the Light, where the Greeks Oecumenius, Theophylact and the Scholiasts have the precedence. Ἁμαρτία is simply *sin*, nothing more or less, but it is certainly sin. Nor does ἔχομεν make any change in the matter, so as to designate the *state* "in which sin has not yet wholly disappeared" (Lücke). But it is less the state which is the result of continued sinning, than the state from which results such sinning, *i. e.*, the state which is not the product of former sin, but the producer of new sin. John says: *We have sin*, and that denotes, both that original sin gives us still trouble, and that we still do sin in thought, in word and in deed; if not as servants, under the dominion of sin, who looking for reward are in the service of sin, yet by hastiness, infirmity or ignorance, now only suffering it by the force of habit or because of its congenital strength, or again by offering it too little resistance; sin insinuates itself into our good and our good works, even into prayer, partly *in affectu* (self-love, hardness in firmness, etc.), partly *in defectu* (gentleness even to parting with virtue, the love of our neighbour, as well as the love of self with fear, etc.). Ἁμαρτία is a sinful demeanour of any kind, falling away from true godliness, from that which is well-pleasing to God; here we may name particular inclinations, tendencies, principles, and especially the forms of the life of the imagination [German: *Artung*

des Phantasielebens, an expression of Ebrard, who alludes to the impure representations of a depraved imagination preceding the overt acts of vice and sin.—M.]. This we must not deny. The sentence with its substance and bearing becomes clearer if we take it in connection with περιπατεῖν ἐν σκότει. *The darkness* is the territory of the undivine, well marked off in every direction and containing the whole system of sin,—the sphere of the *walk*, the life and doings of men. A Christian cannot and may not be said to walk thus in the darkness, but he still has sin. There is still within him a territory which is constantly receiving some kind of admixture from the territory of darkness. He is no longer in sin, but sin is in him; the degrees, indeed, are infinitely different and adjusted to the degree of the cleansing and growth of the inner man. But even John is constrained to say: "We have sin."

We deceive ourselves.—Here we have the Active, not the Middle Voice; ἑαυτὸν πλανᾶν. This form brings out the self-activity which sinks more into the background by the use of the Middle with its Passive form. This brings out a difference like that in the German, "*ich selbst ärgere mich—ich ärgere mich selbst.*" In the latter case the cause is excluded in others, while in the former it is definitely laid within myself, and thus gives prominence to my own guiltiness, whereas the second case describes only a suffering without any one else's guilt. The pronoun of the third person ἑαυτοῦ in the Plural is used frequently both for the first (Rom. viii. 23) and the second person (John xii. 8). See Winer, p. 163, No. 5. The context removes all doubt that the reference is here to deception, to lying and error, as in 1 John iii. 7; Matt. xxiv. 4. 11, and elsewhere. This is also the proper meaning of this verb. It is parallel with ψευδόμεθα of v. 6, but gives greater prominence to self-guilt; there he lies before others in word or deed, here he lies to himself and this sin works into himself greater perdition. There an unregenerate man wants others to believe that he is a Christian, here a regenerate man deceives himself through pride. [Augustine: *Si te confessus fueris peccatorem, est in te veritas: nam ipsa veritas lux est. Nondum perfecte splenduit vita tua, quia insunt peccata: sed tamen jam illuminari cœpisti, quia inest confessio peccatorum.*"—M.]

And the truth is not in us.—Since deceiving oneself runs parallel with the lying of v. 6, so this sentence concludes parallel with *not doing the truth*, (v. 6). The truth, ἡ ἀλήθεια is to be taken objectively (Düsterdieck, Ebrard, Huther); the subjective lies in ἐν ἡμῖν (Bengel: *non in corde, neque adeo in ore*"). It is the Divine truth in Christ; the absolute principle of life from God, received into our heart. Hence it is neither *studium veri* (as maintained by Grotius and Episcopius), nor a truthful disposition (Lücke), nor the truthfulness of self-knowledge and self-examination, of purity (de Wette), nor that which is true in general (S. G. Lange, Paulus), nor better moral perception, *melior rerum moralium cognitio*, as Semler interprets. Moreover, the being, the existence of the Divine truth as the principle of life in us is also denied (οὐκ ἔστιν). Hence this is even stronger than the former οὐ ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, v. 6; the latter is without the deed of the truth, the former without its existence; here the truth being in us is denied, in v. 6, only its manifestation and expression in our life.

VER. 9. *Confession of Sins.*—**If we confess our sins.**—The connection of this sentence with the preceding is not like that of v. 7 with v. 6, by δὲ, as Luther renders; the negatives of the preceding verse are strongly and abruptly antithetical to the positive of this verse; [Ebrard: "Now follows the second thought-member in a conditional sentence which introduces the opposite case. Ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν. Here also John scorns a merely tautological repetition; he does not say: ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν ὅτι ἁμαρτίαν ἔχομεν, but where he opposes to the negative the positive, Confession, he does not speak of sin in general (as a state), but of definite, concrete, specific sins. For this is the form which the confession of sins must assume, in order to be inwardly true and efficacious. The mere confession *in abstracto* that we have sin, would be without truth and value and shrink into a hollow phrase, unless it be attended by the perception and acknowledgment of concrete particular sins. It is much easier to make pious speeches concerning repentance and the greatness of the misery engendered by sin, than in a specific case of sin to see one's wrong, admit and repent it, and to be sorry for it. John requires the latter." —M.].—The Apostle is not satisfied with εἴπωμεν as before, but uses ὁμολογῶμεν, which is much more comprehensive than the former, and of course involves it as well as the inward opining, thinking, saying and feeling convinced, which finally develops into audible utterance and declaration before men; nor is this all, for it involves the additional particular of confessing one's guilt before God, and this confession of guilt must be so lively and profound as to become public and ecclesiastically ordained, and stands in nothing behind the former εἰπεῖν. It is therefore not enough to see here only a *perception* or *recognition* (Socinus: "*Confiteri significat interiorem ac profundam suorum peccatorum agnitionem.*" Baumgarten-Crusius: "ὁμολογεῖν is to perceive, to be sensible, and to become conscious of, as contrasted with εἰπεῖν μὴ ἔχειν ἁμαρτίαν"), or "an *inward* act grounded in the whole inward bias of the mind" (Neander), all which is taken for granted. Nor is it only the real utterance of sin inwardly identified and confessed to oneself (Huther, Düsterdieck), for this also is implied as a consequence. Nor must we exclude the acknowledgment before God, and "*the confession*" ordained for the comfort of a disquieted conscience, from which no truly penitent man will withdraw himself, and which is gladly sought and made by such as are of a contrite heart. [The reference here is to the Lutheran "confession," which must not be confounded with the R. C. auricular Confession. Luther himself distinguishes three kinds of confession: the first, before God (Ps. xxxii. 6), which is so essential that it ought to be the sum-total of a Christian man's life; the second, *towards our neighbour*, and is the confession of love as the former is that of faith (Jas. v. 16. This confession, like the former, is necessary and ordained. The third is that ordered by the Pope to be made secretly into the ears of

a priest with an enumeration of sins. Luther condemned compulsory private confession, and left it optional with individuals to determine if, and what they should confess. Still he commends *private confession*, saying, "it is advisable and good." The *Augsburg Confession*, II., IV., says: "Confession has not been abolished in our Churches, and the usage is not to give the Lord's Body to those who have not been previously examined and absolved," and Luther in his Larger Catechism supplies a form of confession which is very full of private matters (*Catech. Minor.*, IV., 16–29). The present practice varies in different Lutheran establishments, some retaining private confession, others substituting general confession. The latter custom prevails, I believe, among Lutherans in the United States. —M.].—The proud εἰπεῖν stands in antithesis with the humble ὁμολογεῖν, which includes all the aforesaid particulars. The original ὁμολογεῖν signifies *to speak together* [hence *to hold the same language*.—M.], then *to accord, assent to*, and points to a *dialogue* between God accusing and reproaching us in our consciences by His Word and His Spirit, and man assenting thereto in humility, faith and prayer, even unto pouring out his heart before loved fellow-men, from his nearest friend to the spiritual guardian of his soul, the servant of the Word, the Minister of the gifts and Steward of the mysteries of God. Hence the object is designated by τὰς ἁμαρτίας. *The sins* are "the particular manifestations of ἁμαρτίαν ἔχειν" (Huther), "definite, concrete, specific sins" (Ebrard), of whichever kind they may be, lesser and even the least sins, even as repentance goes ever deeper and deeper and attains more clear and distinct perceptions of sin in its endless turns, in its hideousness and wrong. See below on v. 10, and on ch. iii. 4.

He is faithful and righteous.—That is only God the Father (so Lücke, de Wette and the majority of commentators), who is the ruling subject in the work of redemption, since for Christ's sake, and through Christ the Mediator, He forgives and makes us happy, although Christ is referred to in v. 7, and below in ch. ii. 1. The reference to the Father and the Son is inadmissible (J. Lange, Sander, S. Schmid). The subject is not defined, because the reference is to God the Father, who is the principal subject throughout [vv. 5–10]. God *is* faithful, He does not *become* so through forgiveness consequent upon our repentance. God is *faithful* because His Essence accords with His workings, and these in all particular manifestations accord with one another and all of them together. The primary reference is to God's faithfulness towards *us*, to the truth-and-light-essence which reigns in us, if we confess our sins, and is related to and in accordance with His Own Essence (Ebrard); but to this must be added a secondary reference to His Word with its promises of help, blessings, redemption and remission of sins (Düsterdieck, Huther, al.), and this secondary reference follows from the context v. 10, which re-adverts to the Word of God, although it had already been mentioned in vv. 1. 3. 5, and is in perfect harmony with the grammatical usage of both Testaments and the views they express (cf. Ps. xxxii. 8 sqq.; Ezek. xviii. 31 sq.; 1 Cor. i. 9; x. 13; 2 Cor. i. 18–21; 1 Thess. v. 24; Heb. x. 23; xi. 11). And more than this, the term πιστός, held thus absolute and undefined, has surely a wider bearing. It concerns something which He has produced as Creator and suggested as Regent in dispensations, to which the Father and the Lord have given consciousness in the Word, and which is in perfect harmony with the Light-nature of God. He is faithful to His Own Being, to His doings for, and in man as Creator, Preserver, Governor, Redeemer and Revealer. He is "stiff and firm" (Luther) in cleaving to His holy purpose of grace, that is, His faithfulness; πιστός therefore is not only *misericors* (S. Schmid). Besides this we have the epithet δίκαιος, RIGHTEOUS, JUST, which applies to one who acts in accordance with the duties arising from his position; it denotes the disposition and righteousness which gives to every man his due. God is righteous or just when He *punishes* those who walk ἐν σκότει, 2 Thess. i. 5. 7, where the reference is to δικαία κρίσις, then He κατακρίνει but *blesses* those who walk ἐν φωτί, forgiving, cleansing and ultimately glorifying them: It is only the juxtaposition of πιστός and the context which render the limitation of δίκαιος to the judicial character of God with reference to the penitent admissible in this passage. Faithful towards the penitent, agreeably to His Love, His eternal purpose of grace, His Word of promise and His work of redemption, He is also righteous, just, to them as promising them forgiveness and cancelling what is still unrighteous in them in conformity to His appointed laws. Hence δίκαιος is not=*bonus*, *lenis* (Grotius, Schöttgen, Rosenmüller), nor=*æquus*, *benignus* (Semler, G. S. Lange, Carpzov, Bretschneider), nor again=πιστός (Hornejus, "*in promissis servandis integer*"), nor=δικαιῶν (Ebrard). Nor does the righteousness of God appear here as *justitia vindicativa*, which was revealed in the death of Christ, so that the forgiveness of sins is *Christo justa non nobis* (Calov), or in that the sinner, appealing to the ransom paid in the blood of Christ, has his sin cancelled, because it would be unjust to insist upon a twofold payment (Sander). Luther's explanation is excellent; he says, "God is righteous who gives to every man his due and accords to those who confess their sins and believe, the righteousness acquired through the death of Christ, and thus makes thee righteous." This righteousness of God is closely connected with His faithfulness. But we must guard against the distinction that πιστός relates to PECCATA MORTALIA, δίκαιος to PECCATA VENALIA, "*quia sc. justi per opera pœnitentiæ, caritatis etc. merentur de condigno hanc condonationem*" (Suarez). *Faithfulness* is rather the soil and foundation from which *righteousness* springs up. [The blessings conferred upon Christians conformably to the δικαιοσύνη of God, are in fulfilment of the Divine *promises*.—M.]. In Holy Scripture goodness and righteousness, truth and righteousness are syzygies (Nitzsch, *System*, 6th ed., p. 176). Cf. Ps. cxliii. 1, and notes on ch. ii. 29.

To forgive us our sins.—Ἵνα is not=ὥστε, *so that*, or ὅτι with which it alternates, v. 5, ch. iii. 11. The difference is, whether we have here simply the contents of the message (v. 5), or its purpose (ch. iii. 11). The meaning here seems

to be: "He is faithful and righteous *for the purpose* of forgiving. It is His Law and Will to forgive (de Wette), but of course the Will manifests its energy in action (contrary to Huther). [I should prefer putting this with Winer thus: "He is faithful and righteous *in order to* forgive *us*," *i. e.*, the Divine attributes of faithfulness and righteousness are exercised *in order to* our pardon, as Wordsworth puts it.—M.]. The *sins* which have been confessed He remits. Pardon, forgiveness of sins, *i. e.*, the cancelling of the debt of sin and its culpability as well as of the consciousness of guilt or of an evil conscience; justification and reconciliation are therefore the *first* consequence of the confession of sin; the *second* consequence is:

And cleanse us from all unrighteousness.—Neither an epexegetical addition (Semler) nor an allegorical repetition of the preceding (Lange). It is a coördinated clause describing sanctification as the continuation of justification, or redemption as the consequent of reconciliation. On καθαρίζειν see notes on v. 7. Unrighteousness, ἀδικία, is synonymous with ἁμαρτία, and consequently not=*pœna peccati* (Socinus); the latter denotes the *formal*, the former the *material* side of sin; the latter indicates the genesis of sin (or its course of development) which does not coincide with the law, the former the fact of the effect of sin as violating, transgressing and offending against the Law, and on that account liable to punishment and conducing to ruin and perdition.

VER. 10. *Conclusion.*—**If we say.**—Cf. v. 8, of which this verse is not merely the repetition, but the intensification and continuation.

That we have not sinned goes back to ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, but οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν is a much stronger expression; the former denotes a state or condition of which the latter is the actual expression [v. 10 describes the concrete act, v. 8 the abstract state—M.]; we have here the conduct (v. 10) in a certain relation (v. 8) in connection with ἀδικία, v. 9. The use of the Perfect does not warrant an exclusive reference to sins *anterior* to entrance into the Church (Socinus, Paulus), but denotes active sinfulness reaching down to the present and sins just committed; τὰς ἁμαρτίας, v. 9, show that the separate acts, the actuosity [*actuositas*—M.] of the ἁμαρτία (v. 8) are here dwelt upon. [Huther: "The Perfect does not prove that ἡμαρτήκαμεν denotes sinning prior to conversion (Soc., Russmeyer, Paulus, etc.); the reference here, as well as in all the preceding verses, is rather to the sinning of Christians; for no Christian would think of denying his *former* sins. The Perfect is in part accounted for by John's *usus loquendi*, according to which an activity reaching down to the present is often expressed by the Perfect tense, and in part by the fact that confession always has respect to sins committed before.—M.]

We make Him a liar.—This clause answers to ψευδόμεθα and ἑαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν, but is a much stronger expression; we not only lie for ourselves, we not only deceive ourselves, but we make God (αὐτὸν) a liar, and this takes place not without pride, stubbornness or bitterness even unto blasphemy (cf. Jno. v. 18; viii. 58; x. 33; xix. 7. 12). He who is πιστός is blasphemed as ψεύστης, of course only by such men.

And His word is not in us, *i. e.*, His word of promise containing the ἀλήθεια, v. 8; not only the truth and its knowledge are wanting to such persons, but they are also without the Word, the frame and vessel of the truth. As the reference is to Christians, His word probably designates the Gospel of, or concerning Jesus (Socinus, Calov, Neander, Luther, Huther, Düsterdieck), and not the Old Testament in particular (Oecumenius, Grotius, de Wette, al.), or only the New Testament (Lachmann, Rosenmüller), nor in general the revelation of God absolutely, His entire self-disclosure, including the λόγος, Jno. i. 1 (Ebrard).—It is not stamped into the heart in living characters (Spener), it has remained or become again "outwardly or inwardly strange to us" (Huther); for the regenerate may fall from grace. A man that is not conscious of sin still adhering to him, not conscious, therefore, of the true nature of the holiness for which he was born and born again, cannot be or have been wont to contemplate and examine himself in the mirror of the Divine Law, in the Light of the Divine Word, by the pattern held up to us in the revelation of Jesus Christ. Such a one does actually, carelessly or maliciously accuse of falsehood the Word of God and the God of the Word, who looks upon us sinners and calls us to the consciousness of sin. Such men may remember the Word of God, know it by heart, but it is not to them an animating life-principle and impelling power; it is not extant in their inward life and consciousness.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The want of redemption* which is *universal* is also *permanent*, which even in the Church of the redeemed *has not disappeared* (v. 8), although it is *disappearing* more and more (v. 9). The certainty of the difference between walking in the darkness (περιπατεῖν ἐν τῷ σκότει) and walking in the light (περιπατεῖν ἐν τῷ φωτί) is not greater than the certainty that those who are walking in the light have sin adhering to them (ἁμαρτίαν ἔχομεν). Vast as is the difference between these two modes and spheres of life, yet the import of the difference among Christians still affected with sin, but experiencing a daily growing redemption from sin, vanishes before the purity of God the Father, no matter how marked and important the difference may be between a John and individual Church members. The perception and cognition of sin, especially of one's own sin, and the clear consciousness of it in all humility, are indispensable requisites for the walk in the Light. Though your sin, as compared with that of the unregenerate, be light, take care lest you esteem it light. The smallest stain soils a clean garment. If you despise it when you weigh it, be afraid when you count it up. Many little sins make one great sin; many drops make a river.

2. *Self-deception* is so fearful because it will progress to the denial of the truth and the truthfulness of God and His Word, even to open and formal blasphemy (we lie, v. 6; we deceive ourselves, v. 8; we make God a liar, v. 10). Christians are *saints*, but only *in process of being*, and not already complete and perfect. [German:—*becoming*, not yet *become*.—M.]. This contradicts the Donatist error.

3. *Justification* is before *sanctification*, its antecedent; τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀφιέναι precedes the καθαρίζειν ἀπο πάσης ἀδικίας (v. 9); this is the fixed order in the kingdom of God.—Both are acts of God; the first an act occurring once only, the second involving the continuous doing of God [the first is a solitary act, the latter a continuing process—M.]. Although the former is only a solitary, momentary act, and not a process like the latter, the former repeats itself whenever there occurs an interruption in the walk in light, or a loosening or sundering of the fellowship with God (v. 9).

4. *The forgiveness of sins*, as the principal part of justification, consists of different elements: 1. cancelling or diminishing of the punishments of sin; 2. cancelling of the debt of sin and the culpability connected therewith (*culpæ et debiti*); 3. removal of the consciousness of guilt or of an evil conscience; 4. the inclination of Divine grace to the sinner as actually evidenced in the communication of positive, and especially of spiritual and eternal riches; 5. abrogation of the strength and power of sin, wherewith the blotting out of sin did begin, redemption, loosening from the power of evil, the purification of the reconciled sinner from sin. While the two last elements (Nos. 4. 5) mark the transition from the realm of justification to that of sanctification (καθαρίζειν, v. 7) that named first and relating to the punishment of sins is so externally related to the subject needing the forgiveness of sins, that its centre may be sought and found only in the other two, viz., the cancelling of the guilt and the removal of the consciousness of guilt, in perfect analogy with the confession of a justified man, as supplied by St. Paul in Rom. v. 1–5, a passage which may be called classical in this matter: εἰρήνην ἔχομεν. The centre of the forgiveness of sins is the *non-imputatio peccati*. Temporal ills appointed as punishments of sin cease to be punishments to one who has received the forgiveness of sins, they are to him only δοκιμασία or παιδεία; they are not always or altogether cancelled and removed, and are not the worst, particularly as they do not terminate in damnation, ἀπώλεια, whereas guilt and an evil conscience disquiet and cause pain. The forgiveness of sins simply changes the sinner's *relation* to and before God, but afterwards there springs up a different *conduct of God towards the sinner and of the sinner towards God* in sanctification, wherein sins are forgiven and forgotten, the sinner is no longer regarded by God as a sinner, but as another man, and God appears to, and is felt by the sinner no longer as Judge, but as a merciful Father. But such a relationship springing from the forgiveness of sins may indeed be disturbed and impaired and needs therefore repeated renewing and quickening.

5. *The factor of the forgiveness of sins* is God the Faithful and Righteous with His purpose of grace and its revelation (v. 9). No man can forgive his sins to himself; self-redemption is a lie. Very beautifully says Luther in execrable Latin: "*Amor Dei non invenit, sed creat suum diligibile; amor hominis fit a suo diligibili.*"

6. The *condition* of the forgiveness of sins is the *confession of sins* (ὁμολογεῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας) resting upon and conditioned by *perception of sins* and *self-knowledge*. After the death of Christ with its sufferings as well as with the proof of His perfect obedience (v. 7) has operated on the sinner's conscience and caused him by that light to perceive his own sinfulness, and to feel at the same time the mercy of God, as having special regard to, and influence upon him, he ceases in the love of faith in Christ to love himself and sin within himself, is afraid of himself in his ugliness, afraid of sin and its perdition reaching to the bottom of his heart and to eternal damnation, afraid of the wrath of God in the holy energy of holy love, and confesses his sin, which he has discovered, before himself, before God and before men. Thus penitent he not only confesses his sins, but he is also another man, he is regarded as such by God, who now remits to him the debt of sin. This is the initial phase of sanctification, which begins with the forgiveness. The reconciliation of sinners is effected through the reconciliation in the bloody sacrificial death of Jesus, so that as the sons of God by grace, through the Son of God by nature, they make experience of the further communication of His grace, and in virtue thereof grow up into heirs of His glory. This was very correctly perceived by Luther: "Here John meets the objection: 'What must I do then? my conscience reproaches me with my many sins, and John says, Confess thy sins. Thereby he confounds all such objections as if conscience says: What must I do to be saved? How shall I set about to grow better? Nothing else, says he, but this: Confess thy sins to Him, and pray Him to pardon thy grievous guilt.'" "This must be the form of confession," says Ebrard, "in order to be inwardly true and efficacious." The mere confessing *in abstracto* that we have sin, etc. [See above in *Exegetical and Critical* on v. 9.—M.] The child after the deed and with his deed, which is evil, is a very different child, if he goes and sorrowfully and truthfully confesses his sins to his father. ["I will arise and go to my Father and will say unto Him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called Thy son," etc. Luke xv. 18, 19, compared with vv. 21–24.—M.] It is wholly unwarranted that the *Concil. Trident.* XIV. c. 5, p. 87, cites this passage along with Luke v. 14; xvii. 14; Jas. v. 14, in proof of auricular confession, that *auricularis carnificina* and alleges "*Dominus noster Jesus Christus, e terris ascensurus ad cœlos, sacerdotes sui ipsius vicarios reliquit tamquam praesides et judices, ad quos omnia mortalia crimina deferantur.*" Likewise à Lapide says: "*Quam confessionem exigit Johannes? Hæretici solam, quæ fit deo, admittunt; catholici etiam specialem requirunt. Respondeo, Johannem utramque exigere. Generalem pro peccatis levibus, specialem pro gravibus.*" Equally unwarranted is the inference drawn in favour of purgatory from καθαρίσῃ as if *the forgiveness* (ἀφιέναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας) took place here and the *cleansing from all unrighteousness* (καθαρίζειν ἀπὸ τῆς πάσης ἀδικίας) not until hereafter in another state of existence; even the reading καθαρίσει would not warrant such a construction. It is Paul's particular aim to guard his readers against all such false satisfactions and hopes as those in which auricular confession and purgatory entangle men, and pas-

tors and friends also should bear this in mind in private confessions. [See above note on v. 9.—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The truth that we are altogether sinners is very bitter, universal in its application and reaches deep. But those who flatter themselves, and think higher and better of themselves than they really are, lose the truth. If you think any thing of yourself, you ruin yourself. God only knows and is able to make something of man. Without the perception of sin no confession of sin, without confession of sin no forgiveness of sin, without forgiveness of sin no cancelling of sin, *ergo* without grace no salvavation. The denial of our sin and sinfulness will hardly avail with a human judge, but it will ruin us with the Judge Eternal. Without truthfulness and the love of truth you will have no room for God and His word in your heart and lose all susceptibility for them. Be afraid of desiring to know any thing, and especially thy heart, better than God, the Lord.

Starke:—We must not look for perfect holiness in this world; those who entertain the fancy that they may be or are perfect are like those who walk on stilts or over precipitous cliffs: before they are aware of it they will fall and come to naught. Whoso seeks righteousness in absolute deliverance from sin, will lose it if he has it already, and never get it if he has it not. Confession of sins before God is necessary to the forgiveness of sins; but we cannot merit forgiveness by confession of sins. The confession of sins is here simply adduced as a sign of hearty, contrite repentance; it comprises all these parts and is founded on a thorough knowledge accompanied by a perfect hatred and detestation of sin; but it must take place without all cloaking and concealment, sincerely and from the heart. Moreover it must take place with the heart and with the mouth, first and foremost before God whom we have offended therewith and who, we hope, may forgive it us; but also before men, whom we have either offended or vexed thereby. It is a congenital fault of men to love making themselves innocent by their own efforts [literally "to burn themselves white"—M.]; but let none act the hypocrite to himself; for God has concluded all under sin, and no man living is righteous before him.

Spener:—Those also who walk in the light, stand in fellowship with God and are cleansed by the blood of Christ, have sins adhering to and remaining in them, from which they still require to be cleansed. If God has forgiven your sins, He will also cleanse you from all unrighteousness: now if you desire the one benefit without striving for or refusing to receive the other, you seek to overturn the righteousness of God and therefore cannot get it; for God has ordered that they must remain together. If the word of God is to be profitable to us, it must be kept and planted within us in order that it may be powerful and efficacious in us.

[*Collect for second Sunday in Advent:* "Blessed God, who hast caused all holy Scriptures to be written for our learning: grant that we may in such wise hear them, read, mark, learn and *inwardly digest them*, that, by patience and comfort of thy holy Word, we may embrace and ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life, which Thou hast given us in our Lord Jesus Christ. *Amen.*"—M.]

J. Lange:—If God daily forgives penitents their sins, how much more ought we to forgive one another's sins; if we have been offended by men and we do not willingly and truly forgive them, neither will God forgive us.

If one thinks himself perfectly holy and pure, he comes short of,

1. Daily renovation;
2. The sense of godly poverty of spirit;
3. The daily prayer for the forgiveness of the sins and transgressions he has committed;
4. Spiritual watchfulness and carefulness;
5. Avoiding what may excite his inward desires and appetites;
6. The right use of the means of grace which are appointed for the furtherance of virtue;
7. The proper regard and daily appropriation of the blood of Christ for cleansing from all unrighteousness;
8. Bounden sympathy with, and compassion on his faulty and erring brethren. Thus he will at last fall from the grace of God into abominable selfishness and spiritual pride; and, unless he turn from the error of his ways, into eternal perdition.

Whiston:—Although we should like David and Peter fall from fellowship with God, He will, if we humbly and penitently confess those repeated sins and beg for mercy for Christ's sake, forgive them also and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. We must not however boldly go on sinning, but rather shun sin the more.

Heubner:—The beginning of all wisdom is to know one's sin. There is a difference between *having* and *doing sin.* The first is partly former guilt, partly the remaining bias to sin which misleads us to the commission of many sins of infirmity; the second is living in some master sin, to be wholly the servant of sin. The matter stands thus: God says on every page of His Book: All men, consequently you and I also, are sinners; but man says, I am not a sinner. One or the other therefore must lie. If man denies his sin, he affirms that God has lied in His Word; yea, the whole Christian religion, Christ's coming into the world would become a lie; for He came for the salvation of sinners—and there would be no sinners! Hence pride, self-righteousness is so dangerous, hateful and loathsome to God, because the proud accuse God of lying.

Nitzsch:—I. *The warning against the false method of getting acquitted of the burden of our guilt before God.* The Apostle warns,

1. Against the *false interpretation* and depreciation of the law; the precepts, which I have not violated, cannot preserve my righteousness and innocence in the one which I have broken; nor is ignorance of any avail to me, how often I have unconsciously or half-consciously transgressed; more malice may lie concealed in a word than in a deed, and more still in a thought. *Knowledge of sin is the only gain we can derive from the law.*

2. *Against excuses of sin* from external or in-

ternal circumstances (*the world, fate, human nature*); we lose more by taking from God what is His, than if we give up all self-praise. Why did you not threaten or entice with God when men threatened or enticed you with the world, and seek to lead those to virtue who wanted to mislead you to vice? and have you always done the good you knew and were able to do? *That* ignorant sinner remains to be found who has not knowingly transgressed the Divine precepts.

3. *Of false satisfactions;* for they contain one and all an untrue and unhappy release from the state of guilt.

II. *The true way of getting acquitted of our guilt before God:*

1. *Ask what the confession of our sins is;* and,

2. *Consider how on the right confession of sin God the True and Righteous will forgive us our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness.*

The man who confesses his sins in Ps. xxxii., does not make a show of his wickedness, nor regard his transgressions with the fear or carelessness of the natural man, nor say *yea* to the general situation and complaint, and yet feel his guilt as he feels the regular pulsation of his heart, satisfied with his condition. No, his whole being, thinking, moving and life fully participate in his confession, which insists upon the full act and truth of our separation from sin and the accomplishing of all that to which grace in Christ will lead us. It is full knowledge of sin and of *our* sin in us; we feel truly the guilt and misery of sin and that sin imperils our life, we confess in despair unto salvation, yet not without faith, but in faith in holy Love. This is the way with the beginning and progress of being cleansed from all unrighteousness.

T. A. Wolf:—*Of the true constitution of those who live without the knowledge of sin.*

1. *Its marks:* rude security, tender selfishness, self-contented pride.

2. *Its consequences:* without the light of the truth, without the consolation of forgiveness, without strength for real amendment.

3. *Its end: either dying without the knowledge of sin,* partly with fearful presumptuousness, partly with a firm courage that might make us doubt our belief, *or attaining to a penitent and sincere knowledge of our sin.*

Krummacher:—*The throne of grace*—1. Is *concealed* from *ignorant* or *bad* self-righteous men; 2. *Unveiled*—to believers; 3. *Left too soon* by levity, idleness, or culpable opinionativeness.

Friedrich:—Either *God* is a *liar*, or *we* are *altogether sinners.* 1. A *call to decision* as to whether we will believe God's Word in general or not. 2. A *call from sleep* whether we will continue to yield ourselves to the dream of self-deception or not. 3. A call of the *judgment,* whether we will seek the grace of the forgiveness of our sins, or be lost forever.

Clauss:—*The Confession:* 1. What it is? 2. What are its effects?

Besser:—God grant that the truth be written not only in our confessions, but in our hearts!—No sanctification unless its root be forgiveness; and no forgiveness unless its fruit be sanctification.

[Stanhope:—On v. 9, "That the true purport of this condition be not mistaken, it is fit we remember that nothing is more usual in Scripture than to express a man's duty by some very considerable branch of it. Thus the whole of religion is often implied in the love or the fear of God; and thus confession here, no doubt, denotes not only an acknowledgment of our faults, but all that deep humility and shame, all that afflicting sorrow and self-condemnation, all that resolution against them, all that effectual forsaking them for the future, all that diligence to grow and abound in the contrary virtues and graces, all that entire dependence on the merits and sacrifice of our crucified Redeemer, all that application of His Word and sacraments ordained to convey this cleansing blood to us, which accompany such acknowledgments, when serious and to the purpose, and which are elsewhere represented as constituent parts of repentance and necessary predispositions to forgiveness. In the mean while, as the mention of this singly was sufficient, so was no part of repentance as proper to be mentioned as this; for it was directed to persons vain and absurd enough to suppose themselves void of sin, and thereby evacuating, so far as in them lie, the whole Gospel of Christ; for the Gospel propounds a salvation to all men, to be obtained only by His death,—a death undergone on purpose that it might propitiate for sin, and consequently a death needless to them who had no sin; a death of none effect to any who do not allow the necessity and trust to the virtue of it, for the remission of their own sins; but to all who do, so beneficial that God can as soon renounce His Word, as disappoint their reasonable expectations. His promise is passed, and He is faithful; the Judge of all the earth cannot but do right; His Son has paid the debt, and He is just; He will not therefore require from the principal what the Surety has already discharged. So sure are we to be happy, if we be but sensible how miserable we have made ourselves; so sure to be miserable, if puffed up with vain confidence in our own real impotence, and insensible that to Jesus Christ alone we owe the very possibility of our being happy."]

[Barrow:—"When from ignorance or mistake, from inadvertency, negligence or rashness, from weakness, from wantonness, from presumption we have transgressed our duty and incurred sinful guilt; then, for avoiding the consequent danger and vengeance, for unloading our consciences of the burden and discomfort thereof, with humble confession in our mouths, and serious contrition in our hearts, we should apply ourselves to the God of mercy, deprecating His wrath and imploring pardon from Him, remembering the promise of John: "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."—M.].

[*Sermons:*

Vv. 8., 9. Augustine: If we say that we have no sin, etc. Libr. of the Fathers, 20. 947.

Trench: Sin forgiven by a faithful and just God.

Ver. 9. Burnet, Gilbert: God's readiness to receive returning sinners. Pract. Serm., 2. 321.

Hook, W. T.: Auricular Confession. Controversies of the Day, 187.—M.].

The Third Inference.—Reconciliation and Redemption.

Chapter II. 1–2.

1. My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man
2 sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he[1] is the
propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for *the sins*[2] *of* the whole world.

Verse 2. [[1] καὶ αὐτὸς—ἐστι. "And He is Himself." Lillie: "Here the emphatic or exclusive force of αὐτὸς is important. He is the only propitiation for sin. The penitent may trust the Advocate who, righteous Himself, died for him. Such an Advocate God will hear." The emphatic force is retained by Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva (he it is that); Syr. Latin versions except Castal. (*ipse*), German (the same); French vss. (*c'est lui qui*) Bengel (*ipse. Hoc facit epitasin.* PARACLETUS *valentissimus, quia ipse* PROPITIATIO).—Lachmann following A. B. Vulg. places ἐστι before ἱλασμός.—M.]

[[2] German: "But also for the whole world." Winer, p. 599, specifies this clause as an instance of *oratio variata*, pointing out that in περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, instead of the last words περὶ τῶν ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, or instead of the first περὶ ἡμῶν might have been used.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection.—Luther is prepared to call him a theologian who is able to show the consistency and agreement of this passage. He agrees however with Augustine, who says: "*Et ne forte impunitatem videretur dedisse peccatis, quia dixit: fidelis est et justus, qui mundet nos ab omni iniquitate, et dicerent jam sibi homines: peccemus, securi faciamus, quod volumus, purgat nos Christus,—tollit tibi* malam securitatem *et inserit* utilem timorem. *Male vis esse securus, solicitus esto; fidelis enim est et justus, ut dimittat nobis delicta nostra, si semper tibi displiceas et muteris, donec perficiaris. Ideo quod sequitur? filioli.—Sed forte surrepit de vita humana peccatum. Quid ergo fiet? Jam desperatio erit? Audi. Si quis, inquit, peccaverit, etc.*" So Bede, Calvin, Calov, Düsterdieck. [Alford thinks that there is more in the connection than this: "It is not corrective only of a possible mistake, but it is progressive—a further step taken in the direction of unfolding the great theme of this part of the Epistle, enounced in ch. i. 5. The first step for those walking in the light of God was, that they should confess their sins: the next and consequent one, that they should forsake them, and agreeably to their new nature, keep His commandments. This verse introduces that further unfolding of our subject, which is continued, and especially pressed as regards the one great commandment of love, in our vv. 3–11."—M.]. The difficulty lies not so much in the sequence of ideas as in the ethical relation and agreement of the points under consideration, viz.: the grace of God and reconciliation through Christ, the universality and power of sin and man's wrestling with it. On the one hand, the aid of God and Christ must neither make us disheartened in the struggle with sin, nor render us confident that we are sure to have it, and, on the other, the power of sin must not terrify us as if all were in vain.

Ver. 1*a*. *Call to the contest.* **My little children.**—Thus "*tum propter ætatem suam, tum propter paternam curam et affectum*" (Hornejus), and because he was their spiritual father (Gal. iv. 9), and as John called out to the lapsed youth (Euseb. *H. E.* III, 23); τί με φεύγεις, τέκνον, τὸν σαυτοῦ πατέρα; Lorinus ("*Diminutiva nomina teneri ac blandientis sunt amoris signa*"). So Ch. ii. 12, 28; iii. 18; iv. 4; v. 21, only μου is certain, but in ch. iii. 18, it is uncertain. Here, just in view of the danger, the most tender and heartfelt love is awake.

These things write I.—The Plural ταῦτα (not τοῦτο), has respect, not to a particular point, but to the whole in its vital harmony. We should be eager for the contest with sin, because God is light; because walking in the light is the preservative of our fellowship with God, and the means of deriving the benefits of the blood of Christ; because we must not deny having sin, and because God will gladly rid us of it.

That ye sin not.—This is the design of his writing. *Sinning* applies to particular sins, not to small faults and inadvertencies only which would properly be no sins; they might gradually fall even into mortal sin (ch. v. 16). It is neither = *peccatis manere* (Socinus, Episcopius), still less = to continue unbaptized (Löffler).

Ver. 1*b*. *The aid.* **And if any man sin** [better: and if **any one** sin.—M.].—Not an antithesis (*Vulg.* δὲ), but simple copulation (καί); since even in zeal against sin there ever recurs the indubitable case of sinning (ἐάν τις cf. the note on ch. i. 6). [ἐὰν simply admits the *possibility* of sinning.—M.]. Both fighting against sin and sinning, go always together. The reference is general, and hence the apostle continues in the Plural. But the apostle does not affirm an inward necessity, that it *must* be so, as Calvin supposes: *nam fieri non potest, quin peccemus;* it may be so in fact, but the conditional particle must not be turned into a causal. Socinus also disfigures the thought; "*si quis peccat, i. e., post Christum agnitum, et professionem nominis ipsius adhuc in peccatis manet, necdum resipuit.*" The note of time and the intensification of the thought, are purely arbitrary; "for, on the one hand, a true Christian *may* sin, but he cannot *remain* in sins, and on the other, to one remaining in sins Christ is not the παράκλητος" (Huther). "If any one sin—not with the wilfulness of sin, but in spite of the will of his mind, which says *no* when sin is present." (Besser).

We have an advocate with the Father.—On παράκλητος see Lange on John xiv. 16, Vol. IV. p. 311 sq. [German edition.—M.]. The word has here undoubtedly a Passive sense, viz.: *advocatus*,

orator, causæ patronus (Luther, *Vormund*), *intercessor*. Its application to Christ, although its application in the Gospel, is limited to the Holy Spirit (Jno. xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7), is anticipated in the first of these passages by the words ἄλλος παράκλητος; Christ is also Paraclete, the Holy Ghost only another Paraclete; this is clear from the context. ["Christ is the real παράκλητος, the Holy Ghost His substitute" Huther.—M.]. Here Christ is παράκλητος πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (cf. on ch. i. 2), there the Holy Ghost is μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. The Holy Ghost carries on the work of Christ in His followers, the world with its threatenings notwithstanding, but Christ pleads the cause of His followers before God the Father, interceding for them with Him, even as Heb. iv. 14–16; vii. 25–28; 8, 1sqq.; Col. ix. 24, relate to a transaction between the Father and the Son. The ὑπερεντυγχάνειν of the Holy Ghost, Rom. viii. 26, is a different matter, and does not affect the difference marked by John. The apostle says *Father*, not *God*, because the new relation into which those who are reconciled through Christ have been translated, is assumed as already existing; hence not only because the *Son* intercedes with Him, but because He intercedes for believers who, through Him, have become τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ (ch. iii. 1, 2). The activity of the Paraclete is ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25).—Ἔχομεν indicates two things. 1. The Plural, as in ch. 1, 6 sqq., denotes the general character of the intercession and the universal want of Christians of such an intercessor. Augustine's note is capital: "*Non dixit:* habetis, *nec:* me habetis *dixit, sed et Christum posuit, non se, et* habemus *dixit, non habetis. Maluit se ponere in numero peccatorum, ut haberet advocatum Christum, quam ponere se pro Christo, advocatum et inveniri inter damnandos superbos.*" [The same Father says in the same connection after the words cited at the head of this section under *Connection:* "*Ille est ergo advocatus: da operam tu ne pecces: si de infirmitate vitæ subrepserit peccatum, continuo vide, continuo displiceat, continuo damna; et cum damnaveris, securus ad judicem venies. Ibi habes Advocatum: noli timere ne perdas causam confessionis tuæ. Si enim aliquando in hac vita committet se homo disertæ linguæ et non perit: committis te verbo et periturus est?*"—M.]. 2. The Present indicates that the intercession is continued and permanent in its operation.

Jesus Christ the Righteous.—Δίκαιος is evidently put in antithesis to the still sinning children of God, and is not=ἅγιος, *innocens et sanctus* (a Lapide), but His sinlessness and holiness as manifested in His life, "righteous, unblemished and sinless" (Luther). While the sense of *bonus, lenis* suggested by Grotius is too weak here, as also in ch. i. 9, that given by Ebrard=δικαιῶν, says too much, and is incorrect, because it is not the province of the intercessor to δικαιοῦν, and that of Bede, who says, "*justus advocatus, injustas causas non suscipit,*" is equally inadmissible, because δίκαιος is not the adjective belonging to παράκλητον. Nor can it be taken in the sense of "*fidelis et verax*" (Socinus), like πίστος ch. i. 9. It corresponds exactly with the description of the interceding High-priest, Heb. vii. 26; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 18. Moreover here, where we have neither χριστὸν alone, nor υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, but χριστὸν, preceded by Ἰησοῦν, with emphatic force, the reference is not to the λόγος ἄσαρκος, but to the λόγος ἔνσαρκος, who has shed His blood (ch. i. 7). For both in Heb. vii. 25 sqq.; iv. 14 sqq., and Rom. viii. 34, the intercession of Christ is connected with His suffering on the Cross, as part of His high-priestly work and office. If Grotius supplies, and on the strength of ch. v. 16; Gal. vi. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 6, puts after ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ "*Et se ecclesiæ regendæ sanandæque tradiderit*" remarking, "*non dicit: habet ille advocatum, sed ecclesia habet, quæ pro lapso precatur,*" and "*preces ecclesiæ Christus more advocati deo patri commendat,*" (Jno. xvi. 26,) it is not *a Spiritu Sancto, sed a Grotiana audacia*, as Calov expresses himself. The Plural ἔχομεν does not involve the idea of the Church, but designates rather every individual, even the most advanced Christian, for every one is the object of our holy Saviour's intercession. And this very thing is the comfortable help vouchsafed to those who fight against sin.—All this shows that Christ, who died for us and is now at the right hand of the Father, is our Advocate pleading the cause of every Christian with the Father, provided that, clearly and profoundly conscious of his guilt, he appear before God as a penitent, and fight manfully against the sin in his heart. Christ, as the Sinless and Righteous One, lays before the Father the supplication of the penitent sinner, supported by His intercession, and as He has died for him on the cross, as He has wooed and drawn him to Himself to walk in light, so He desires to preserve him therein, and to aid him towards the attainment of sanctification, in the continued activity of an advocate in glory, even as He did intercede for His followers in the days of His humiliation (Jno. xvii. 9; Luke xxii. 32; xxiii. 34).

VER. 2. *The assurance.* **And He is the Propitiation for our sins.**—*Καὶ* is here the simple *copula*, which adds a further particular, and, therefore, neither=*quia* (a Lapide), nor=*nam* (Beza). This particular relates to the Person of the Intercessor (*καὶ αὐτὸς=et ipse, idemque*) and is of perpetual validity and operation (ἐστὶ), like and parallel to the preceding ἔχομεν παράκλητον. The word ἱλασμὸς occurs only here and in ch. iv. 10, and there also connected with περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. The verb ἱλάσκεσθαι is also found in a *Passive* sense, Luke xviii. 13: ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ, where the reflexive sense is not wholly quiescent; be (become thou) mercifully disposed, suffer thyself to be mercifully disposed, it is consequently ἵλεων γενέσθαι, *propitium fieri*. Or with the obliteration of the reflexive force peculiar to the Middle, it has an *Active* sense, *e. g.*, Heb. ii. 17: ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, to atone, expiate for the sins of the people, *expiare*. In classical Greek ἱλάσκεσθαι denotes only *propitium facere aliquem*, indicating the attempt of the pagan sacrifices to reconcile *God*. In Holy Scripture, and especially in the New Testament, God *is* not reconciled by us, but *reconciles*, as we learn from the instructive passage, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, cf. Col. i. 20; Eph. ii. 16. Man is καταλλαγείς, God only καταλλάξας, ἀποκαταλλάξας ἑαυτῷ, εἰς αὐτόν. In *Clement Rom.* we find already ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τὸν θεόν, but it does not occur in a canonical writing. The Socinians have not overlooked this. Schlichting says: "*Non est ergo cur quispiam ex hac*

placandi voce concludat, deum a Christo nobis fuisse placatum" (see Delitzsch, Note on Heb., p. 97). The same view is very distinctly contained in our parallel passage, ch. iv. 10: αὐτὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἱλασμὸν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, God the Father has constituted the propitiation by sending therefor His Son. *He* Himself **is the propitiation**, which comprises the High-priest and the sacrifice. For according to Kühner 1, § 378, p. 418, ἱλασμὸς denotes "the intransitive relation of the stem verb." It is, therefore, neither=ἱλαστήρ (Grotius, al.), for He is also the propitiatory sacrifice, nor=ἱλαστήριον (Bengel, Lücke, de Wette al.), for He is the Agent accomplishing the propitiation (or expiation). As He *is* the Light of the world, the Truth, the Life, the Way in Himself, and not only has, shows or brings it, so He is Himself the Propitiation; it is "really existing in His Person" (Düsterdieck); He is "not the Reconciler or Propitiator through something external to Him, but through Himself" (Lücke). Thus He is called our ἁγιασμός, 1 Cor. i. 30; cf. 2 Cor. v. 21.—Nor is He ἱλασμὸς Θεοῦ, but περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. The sins are the points with which the propitiation is concerned, to which it has reference (περί); neither substitution is mentioned here, nor the manner and means how this propitiation is accomplished and brought about. John evidently designates church-members by ἡμῶν (*fidelium*, as Bengel explains the word); he writes to Christians, not to Jews. The sequel also simply contrasts Christians and non-Christians. Bengel justly observes with reference to ch. v. 19: "*quam late patet peccatum, tam late propitiatio.*" On that account the apostle adds:

Yet not for ours only, but also for the whole world.—Here is simply *oratio variata.* He might have said: ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, joining what precedes with ἁμαρτιῶν, or connecting before with ἱλασμός, οὐ περὶ ἡμῶν δὲ μόνον, which would answer to the conclusion as it stands. See Winer p. 599; [also Appar. Crit. v. 2, 2.—M.]. A similar variation is found Heb. ix. 7. The point is, therefore, not breviloquence (Ebrard), nor the supplying of τῶν (Grotius, de Wette, Düsterdieck). Nor was it because of the evil inhering in the κόσμος, since it is equally applicable to Christians (contrary to Huther). The Apostle's design was manifestly to show the universality of the propitiation, in the most emphatic manner, and without any exception. This renders any and every limitation inadmissible. We must not except with Calvin the *reprobos*, because of predestination; it is rather the double *decretum absolutum* which is here excluded. Neither is it admissible to take κόσμος as *ecclesia electorum per totum mundum dispersa* (as Bede does), nor to explain it of the heathen only (Oecumenius, Cyrillus, Hornejus, Semler, Rickli). In like manner we must not think only of the apostle's age, but rather of the totality of unbelieving mankind in general (Spener, Paulus, de Wette, Lücke, Sander, Neander, Düsterdieck, Huther). As in ch. i. 7, the work of Christ extends to *all the sins* of His people, so it extends here to the sin of the *whole world*, without distinguishing between contemporaneous and successive generations (Baumgarten-Crusius), or finding here any reference to the difference between *sufficientia* and *efficacia*. This renders it also perfectly clear that while Christ is the Paraclete of believing penitent Christians only, His propitiation has respect to, and is sufficient for all men in general. The idea of παράκλητος is, therefore, not wider than and including ἱλασμὸς, as Bede supposes ["*advocatum habemus apud patrem qui interpellat pro nobis et propitium eum ac placatum peccatis nostris reddit.*"—M.]; or, *vice versa*, ἱλασμὸς is not the wider idea including παράκλητος (de Wette, Rickli, Frommann); the two ideas are rather coördinate, yet so that παράκλητος pre-supposes ἱλασμὸς; Christ has made a propitiation sufficient for all men. He *is* Himself the propitiation, and would fain appear before the Father as the Paraclete of all men. There are two different parts of the Redeemer's work, each having its real mode of action and effect, but of course in an ethical life-sphere.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The frontiers of Christianity.*

Systems which, like Pelagianism, do not acknowledge the *necessity* (ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ) or like Manichaeism with its fundamental dualism, deny the *possibility* (ἵνα μὴ ἁμάρτητε) *of redemption*, if the question bears on the objects of redemption, and systems which, like Ebionism, deny the *Divinity* (δίκαιον), or in the opposite case, like Docetism, the *humanity* (Ἰησοῦν) of the Redeemer, if the question bears on the *subject* of redemption; such systems are wholly foreign to Christianity.

2. *Of Christ.*

a. Sinlessness and holiness is the fundamental trait of His Being. He requires neither an expiation nor the help of an advocate, but He makes the one and accords the other.

b. His work on earth is indicated by His being ἱλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν—καὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου. This implies,

α. As He is δίκαιος, and according to 1 Cor. i. 30: σοφία—δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις, so He is Himself, so there is existing in Him, also ἱλασμός; and beside Him and without Him there is no propitiation for our sins.

β. As He only is δίκαιος, and all men ἄδικοι, so it is He only who has made and does make a propitiation for all men; this affirms the universality of the only ἱλασμὸς.

γ. The atonement extant relates to the sins which violate the majesty of God, disturb the holiness of the order of His Kingdom, and are the products of an enmity to the Glorious One, so that they arouse the reaction of the ὀργή; and therefore, as distinguished from καταλλαγή, reconciliation which bears on sinners and creates a disposition, *reconciliatio*, ἱλασμὸς is to be taken in the sense of atonement, propitiation [or expiation] *expiatio*, and as regulating a disturbed relationship. *Expiation* renders quiescent the ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, whereas reconciliation allays the enmity of man in his ἁμαρτία, cf. Nitzsch, *System* § 135.

δ. The effect of the ἱλασμὸς is that he, whose sins are expiated, ceases to belong to the κόσμος, but not irresistibly, nor by a physical process, but only as a real beginning and supporting foundation, on which we must take our stand, and progress, in order that the καταλλαγή may ensue,

and that we may become partakers thereof; in our *ethical* demeanor we must do our part whenever occasion and aid are afforded us, otherwise we shall lose the ground of salvation, the beginning of blessedness, and the receptivity for the same. But our passage is silent as to the manner how it is done; even the *αἷμα* (ch. i. 7) is tacitly pre-supposed. Nor may an inference respecting *substitution* be drawn from this passage, as Nitzsch (*System*, p. 284) has done.

η. Christ is and remains the *ἱλασμός*—both for *all* sins and the sins of *all*, and for all ages and generations; His atonement is permanent in its operativeness. Not only in a general way, but the individual, every individual, is the object of expiation and reconciliation. This passage teaches the predestination of the salvation of all men.

c. *His work in heaven* is indicated by *παράκλητος πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*; which imports,

α. That it concerns a work after His entrance into His original glory, consequently that which the glorified Redeemer does for us in heaven; He is not only a *historical* person and power, whose influence is felt for centuries, like Luther and his reformation, and the Greeks with their civilization, but He is an *ever living person* above, and at the same time in the world's history.

β. Jesus, the Christ, is consequently the Paraclete, not only as to His Divine, or as to His human nature, but in His Divine-human person in its glory with the Father.

γ. This work concerns our need of help remaining after our expiation and reconciliation effected by Him on earth, which need of help consists in our repeated sinning anew, and the consequent peril threatening anew our filial relation to God the Father effected by him; He desires "to cancel again the effects of our sins on our relation to God," (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* 11, 1, p. 545), on the object of this work, are "believers still sinning in their walk in the light" (Huther), and that without any exception.

δ. This work of the exalted Redeemer is an *intercession* for Christians belonging to Him in faith; it is a real work of the Lord, since He not only silently waits for the effects of His reconciliation, but is actively engaged in pressing His merit with the Father, and that, as a *vocalis et oralis intercessio*. Our passage excludes all the intercessions of Romanism, those of the Virgin Mary, and of all the saints, who, as well as St. John, stand in need of intercession. See *Conf. Aug.* XXI., *Apol.* XXI. 10, sqq. For the saints are not *deprecatores*, still less *propitiatores*, *ut orent, non tamen invocandi*. It also dismisses the "grossly sensuous view" combated by Calvin when he says: "*nimis crasse errare eos, qui patris genibus Christum advolvunt, ut pro nobis oret;*" the *intercessio* is not *humilis*. But it is equally false to regard it as only symbolical, as *nuda interpretiva* (*per ostensa merita*), as *Bede* does, or only as the continuing effect of the work of redemption consummated by Christ in His death (Baumgarten-Crusius). Unfounded is the view of Köstlin (*Lehrbegriff*, pp. 81, 192), who understands *παράκλητος* to denote the eternal High-priest, who does not pray, but, as the Father for His sake loves also those who believe in Him, directly excludes intercession, because Jno. xvi. 26 expressly deprecates *ἐρωτᾷν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν*. The intercession of the Paraclete, which contemplates the perfection of believers and their preservation in the Sonship, must be well distinguished from the asking intercession of the High-priest, which contemplates the acceptance of the Sonship, cf., Lange on John xvi. 26, Vol. 4, p. 343, n. 16. [German edition, M.].

3. *Of Christians.*

a. Sinfulness continues even in the most advanced Christians, and manifests itself in the constant recurrence of particular sins.

b. *The warfare against sin*, however, is earnestly insisted upon. John does not say whether it is possible to a believer *not* to sin; nor does he say that he *must* sin (Calvin: "*nam fieri non potest, quin peccemus*"), but demands that Christians should strive not to commit sin. The Apostle's love of the Church (*τεκνία μου*) constrains him to charge them not to sin, because those who sin not, keep themselves, (*τηρεῖ ἑαυτὸν*, ch. 5, 18) preserve their sonship with God and their regeneration (ch. iii, 6. 9). He views sin as man's ruin and ungodliness.

c. The Christian requires no other *human* mediator, or priest; he has become spiritual himself, and no longer secular, himself a priest and not a layman. These antitheses vanish to those who live in faith in Christ the Redeemer, do every thing through Him and for His sake, and refer every thing to Him.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Sin should not be denied, but fought and conquered. Seek with Jesus the Sinless One for true humility in the knowledge of thy sin, and thou wilt find with Him the right courage to overcome thy sin. As thy perception of sin grows more keen, thy sensibility even of the most secret and most trifling sin more acute and delicate, thy sorrow for sin more profound, thy struggle with it more desperate, so thy perception of the Saviour's life and work will also grow more keen, thy hearing of God's still small voice more acute, thy joy over the cleansing power of His word and work more profound, the Lord's victory over thee and thy triumph with Him more certain. Although a man sanctify himself, he still sins. It is Jesus Christ, the Righteous, in His glory, who prays for the fallen, for an unrighteous world, that cannot forgive and forget any thing that judges and condemns. The *demand* not to sin is not devoid of *consolation*, if we do sin; but he only that strives to satisfy the demand will be satisfied with the consolation. Never forget that Christ has expiated sin, and that *He* had to expiate it, and thou wilt take a serious view of sin.

AUGUSTINE:—"*Ibi habes advocatum, noli timere, ne perdas causam confessionis tuæ. Si enim aliquando in hac vita committit se homo disertæ linguæ et non perit, committis te verbo et periturus es?*"

LUTHER:—The righteousness of Jesus Christ is on our side; for the righteousness of God is ours in Jesus Christ.—It is a certain fact, that thou art a part of the world: lest perchance thy heart might deceive thee and say: "The Lord died for *Peter* and *Paul—not for me!*"

STARKE:—Teachers should deal with their hearers as a father deals with his children; but

then the hearers should so demean themselves that such a course is possible.—Whoso serves the Church of Christ with his writings, should examine himself as to the motive which prompts him; if he does unite with the motive of ambition or covetousness, it is sin to him; but if his motive is really and truly the glory of God, and he desires to make his gifts useful to men, it is well-pleasing to God.—Blessed consolation! Christ is our advocate and spokesman, who has taken our cause in hand! Rejoice, ye tempted ones! there is no danger. Our Saviour claims His right.—

HEUBNER:—The Christian promises of grace are holy and not designed to abet idleness; they are not given to careless and hardened sinners, but to sorrow-stricken, contrite and penitent sinners.—Here is expressly taught Christ's intercession for His people. It is of infinite value before God, because it is the intercession of the Righteous, of the perfectly Holy One, who may dare to intercede with God.

[CRANMER, ABP.:—"Christ was such an High Bishop, that He, once offering Himself, was sufficient by one effusion of His blood to abolish sin unto the world's end. He was so perfect a Priest, that by one oblation He purged an infinite heap of sins, leaving an easy and ready remedy for all sinners, that His one sacrifice should suffice unto all men that would not show themselves unworthy, and He took unto Himself not only their sins, that many years before were dead and put their trust in Him, but also the sins of those, that until His coming again, should truly believe His gospel. So that now we may look for none other Priest or sacrifice to take away our sins, but only Him and His sacrifice. And as He dying once was offered for all, so, as much as pertained to Him, He took all men's sins unto Himself."—M.].

[CHURCH HOMILIES:—"All men are God's creation and image, and are redeemed by Christ."—M.]

[BEVERIDGE:—"If any man's sins be not pardoned—it is not for want of sufficiency in Christ's sufferings, but by reason of his own obstinacy or negligence in not performing the conditions required for applying the sufferings of the human nature in Christ unto his own particular person. For seeing that that death, which was threatened to all mankind in the first Adam, was undergone by the whole nature of man in the second; hence all particular persons comprehended under that general nature, are capable of receiving the benefit of those sufferings, if they will but apply them rightly to themselves."—M.].

[BARROW:—"*The whole world* is here mentioned in contradistinction from all Christians to whom St. John speaketh in this place: that *the whole world* of which he says below, that it 'lieth in wickedness.' Ch. 5, 19. In this and in various other places, where Jesus is called the Saviour of the world, that the world, according to its ordinary acceptation, and as every man would take it at first hearing, doth signify the whole community of mankind, comprehending men of all sorts and qualities, good and bad, believers and infidels; not, in a new unusual sense, any special restrained world of some persons, particularly regarded or qualified, will, I suppose, easily appear to him, who shall, without prejudice or partiality, attend to the common use thereof in Scripture, especially in St. John, who most frequently applieth it as to this, so to other cases or matters."—M.].

[NEANDER:—"What now is the practical significance of this truth, that Christ, the Holy, is our ever-abiding Advocate with the Father? To this perpetual mediation through the living Christ, to His ever-abiding priesthood for those who are reconciled to God through Him, corresponds the ever-remaining need of mediation in believers, their constant dependence upon the priesthood of Christ, in union with whom they are a generation consecrated to God. Under every feeling of sin and infirmity, in all their temptations and conflicts, they may securely trust in their indissoluble union with this Divine human Personage, who Himself has felt all their necessities, and is near to them in the intimate sympathy of perfect love. Moreover, their whole inward and outward Christian life, flowing as it does from this sense of continual need of redemption, will take its character from this ever-continuing mediation of Christ, and their own conscious connection therewith."—M.].

[VER. 1. BUNYAN, JOHN: The work of Jesus Christ as an Advocate, clearly explained and largely improved, for the benefit of all believers. Many editions.

CHARNOCK, STEPHEN: The Intercession of Christ. Works, 8, p. 1.

FULLER, A.: Christianity the Antidote to presumption and despair. Sermons, 326.

HOOK, W. F.: Jesus Christ the Righteous. Sermons, 307.

VV. 1. 2. CRISP, T.: Sermons, 2, pp. 251–386.
Revelation of grace no encouragement to sin.
The faithful Friend at the bar of justice.
Christ's advocateship for all the elect.
Christ's righteousness only dischargeth the sinner.
The act of believing is not our righteousness.
Faith the fruit of union.
Christ alone our Mercy-seat.

BEVERIDGE, BP.: The satisfaction of Christ explained. Works, 4. 162.

SEABURY, BP.: The atonement of Christ. Disc. 2. 118. M.].

---

6. ***Mark of the walk in the light. Obedience to the commandments of God, especially brotherly love.***

CHAPTER II. 3—11.

3 And hereby we[1] do know that we know[2] him, if we keep[3] his commandments.
4 He that saith,[4] I know[5] him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the

5 truth is not in him. But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God
6 perfected[6]: hereby know we that we are in him. He that saith he abideth in him
7 ought himself also so[7] to walk, even as he walked. Brethren,[8] I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning
The old commandment is the word which ye have heard from the beginning.[9]
8 Again, a new commandment I write unto you, which thing is true in him and in
9 you;[10] because the darkness is past,[11] and the true light now shineth. He that saith
10 he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in[12] darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in
11 him.[13] But he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that[14] darkness hath blinded his eyes.

Verse 3. [[1] German: "And hereby we know;" the emphatic *do* know in E. V. suggests an idea foreign from the text.—M.].

[[2] German: "That we *have* known him." Lillie: "Have attained to this knowledge." Where knowledge is spoken of *merely* as present, γνώσκω. or οἶδα is used, not ἔγνωκα. See John's epistles *passim*.—E.V. vv. 13, 14; ch. iii. 6; iv. 16; 2 John i., and generally elsewhere."—M.].

[3] Cod. Sin. has φυλάξωμεν for τηρῶμεν; which is, however, given as well. The future by no means suits the Apostle's thought.

Verse 4. [4] A. B. Cod. Sin. al. insert ὅτι before ἔγνωκα. John usually employs the *oratio indirecta* with the *infin.*, as in vv. 6. 9; ch. i. 6, or *temp. fin.* with ὅτι, as in ch. i. 8, 10. The *oratio directa* with ὅτι occurs only in one other place, ch. iv. 20. It is difficult to understand why ὅτι should have been introduced here from there. [Rather: ὅτι was possibly omitted by later transcribers, on account of the difficulty it presented.—M.].

[[5] German: "I *have* known Him," ἔγνωκα see above on v. 3, note 2—M.].

Verse 5. [[6] German: "In such an one the love of God is truly perfected." Lillie: "Truly in this man hath the love of God been perfected."—M.].

Verse 6. [7] C. Cod. Sin. insert οὕτως before περιπατεῖν. There is no reason why it should be inserted, although it might have seemed superfluous to some. [It is wanting in A. B. Vulg.—M.] It renders the thought very emphatic.

Verse 7. [[8] German: "*Beloved*" M.] ἀδελφοί, Oecum, Mill, Wetstein, is weakly supported; ἀγαπητοί is manifestly the correct reading [A. B. C. Cod. Sin. Syr. Vulg. Griesb. Bengel, al. sustain it.—M.].

[[9] German omits the words "from the beginning," at the close of the verse. The corresponding ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, omitted by A. B. C. Sin. al., are cancelled by Lachm., Tischend., Buttm., Theile.—M.].

Verse 8. [10] ὑμῖν, B. C. Cod. Sin., although the more difficult reading, is better authenticated than ἡμῖν (A.)

[11] σκιά instead of σκοτία lacks the weight of authority, and is clear as to its tendency or origin from the contrast between the economy of the Old and New Testaments.

[German: "Passeth away," παράγεται. The Present should by all means be retained. German: already, ἤδη, better than *now*.—M.].

Verse 9. [[12] German: "*The* darkness," ἡ σκοτία, both here and below in v. 11. The omission of the Article in E. V. obscures the sense.—M.].

Verse 10. [[13] German: "An offence" or "stumbling-block is not in him."—M.].

Verse 11. [[14] German: "The darkness;" "because that darkness" (E. V.) is perplexing and ambiguous, better retain the more correct rendering, "because *the* darkness," ὅτι ἡ σκοτία. German: "where he goeth to."—M.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The Connection. The call to the contest with sin on the ground of the Saviour's antecedent propitiation and lasting intercession is connected with this section of the mark of the true knowledge of and fellowship with God, as that of vital Christianity: see whether thou really art the object of the intercession of the Sinless One with Him who is Light! The *mala securitas* and the *utilis timor* move the Apostle to set this section with the given marks of a true Christian into close connection with the immediately preceding section of the atonement for the sins of the *whole* world, and namely, as a link in the chain of thoughts depending on v. 5.: "That God is Light." His object is to excite a salutary, moral seriousness of purpose in his readers; their obedience to the commandments of God, and especially their practice of brotherly love are given to them as tokens by which they may determine whether they are really in God's kingdom of grace. He warns, therefore, "against the false security of a show-Christianity," and guards his churches "against false confidence and carnal security" (Neander); similar are the views of the greater number of commentators, from Episcopius and Calov down to Düsterdieck, who, however, confines himself to pointing out the dependence of this section also on the leading thought in ch. i. 5, 6, while the former take too narrow views of the connection with ch. ii. 1, 2. The copula καί denotes the close connection and appurtenance of the sequel to the preceding section. Hence it is not correct to make here the beginning of a new section, (Sander: "Having thus far spoken of the proofs of salvation, he now proceeds to exhort his readers to its preservation"), or to connect with ch. i. 5, 6 (Huther).

Obedience to the commandments of God is the general characteristic of true Christianity. (v.v. 3–6).

Ver. 3. **And hereby we know.**—John uses ἐν τούτῳ in order to refer to the sequel, as here, ch. iii. 16, 19, 24; iv. 9, 10, 13, 17; v. 2, or to the preceding, as in v. 5: iii. 10; the reference is generally plain from the context. In the former case the Apostle is wont to indicate the mark *whereby* we know, by the addition of the preposition ἐκ (iv. 13), or by ὅτι (ch. iii. 16, 19; iv. 9, 10), or ἵνα (ch. iv. 17), or ἐὰν (vv. 3, 5), or ὅταν (ch. v. 2), according as he wants to supply either "a really existing, historically given and objectively sure token" (Düsterdieck), on one only ideally existing and described as possible or conditional. The Apostle, who lays a strong emphasis on *knowing*, understands to express in writing the different shades of thought with the same nicety and correctness. ["John uses the formula ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν first as referring the demonstrative pronoun back to what has gone before, as *e. g.* in our v. 5, and in ch. iii. 10. If, however, the demonstrative pronoun in this or a like formula, looks onward, and the token itself, with the cir-

cumstance of which it is a token, follows, he expresses this token variously and significantly, according to the various shades of meaning to be conveyed. Sometimes the token implied in the demonstrative, follows in a separate sentence, as in ch. iv. 2; sometimes the construction is slightly changed, and the sentence begun with ἐν τούτῳ is not regularly brought to a close, but continued in a new and correlative form; *e. g.* ch. iii. 24, where ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν is taken up by ἐκ τοῦ πν. And this way of expression is closely parallel to that where ὅτι completes the construction begun with ἐν τούτῳ. So ch. iii. 16, 19; iv. 9, 10, 13. In these cases the full objective reality of the token, as a fact, is set forth. It is an undoubted fact that He has given us of His Spirit, that He has sent His Son: and from these facts our inference is secure to the other facts in question, that He abideth in us, etc. But in other passages we find instead of this ὅτι an ἵνα, ch. iv. 17, or an ἐὰν, as here, John xiii. 35, or ὅταν, ch. v. 2. This ἐὰν, ὅταν, mark the token implied in ἐν τούτῳ as one not actually existent, an historical or objectively certain fact; but as a possible contingency, something hypothetically and conditionally assumed: in other words as ideal." Düsterdieck, pp. 172, sq.—M.]. He is concerned with the fact,

That we have known Him.—The context must determine who is meant by αὐτὸν, God the Father or Christ; the reason must be sought in the section itself, where in vv. 3–6 we have first the repeated forms αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ and αὐτὸν and once ἐκεῖνος, v. 6. As the latter evidently denotes Christ, so the former applies with equal certainty to God the Father. Hence it was not the immediately preceding verse in which Christ is spoken of, which induced the Apostle to use αὐτὸν and to understand thereby the Father, but rather the all-controlling thought, "God is Light," ch. i. 5. —So Bede, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Lücke, Jachmann, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Brückner, Düsterdieck, Huther, Ebrard. It is referred to Christ by Augustine, Episcopius, Grotius, Luther, Calov, Wolf, Lange, Sander, Neander. Socinus and Calvin are undecided. The word γινώσκειν, occurring twice in juxtaposition, bears each time substantially the same meaning: *to know*. But to know God is not a matter of the understanding only, a knowledge, a knowing, but matter of the whole man; it is an inward life, both matter of the will and of the mind; an entering into, a perceiving in order to be penetrated thereby, in order to receive it in receptivity. The object of this knowing becomes the substance of him that knows; the nature of the object of our knowing determines His coming near us and entering into relationship with us. God cannot be known without Himself; it is only by converse with Him that He allows Himself to be known (Oecumenius; συνεκράθημεν αὐτῷ, Clarius "*societatem habemus cum eo.*"); the knowledge of God presupposes and promotes life-fellowship with Him. This last particular is also intimated by the perfect ἐγνώκαμεν; the real fact of having known Him is described as finished, attended by an after-effect and still further development in continued and ever-growing knowledge; it is parallel to κοινωνίαν ἔχειν μετ' αὐτοῦ, ch. i. 6. Col. 3. "Inward affinity of life, real appurtenance is the unconditional pre-supposition both of knowing and loving; for only those in affinity with each other know and love each other" (Düsterdieck). *We*, the Christians, renewed in Christ, created to His image, are those who know. Hence it is false to take γινώσκειν like the Hebrew יָדַע in the sense of to *love* (Carpzov, S. G. Lange), or only as a theoretical understanding of Divine truth (Socinus, Episcopius); nor may we intermingle knowledge and love, and regard the latter as essential to the former (Bede, Oecumenius, Lücke), although knowledge is conditioned by love (de Wette).—[It is not mere theoretical knowledge, but vital, experimental knowledge flowing from God, being received into the heart, and His influencing our thoughts, our will and our actions. —M.].

If we keep His Commandments.—The verb τηρεῖν, probably connected with τέρας, [more probably with τήρος, a watch, M.], a sign, denotes properly to pay attention, to observe, ἄνεμον (Eccl. xi. 4), τὴν φυλακὴν (Acts xii. 6), the beloved disciples (Jno. xvii. 11 sqq.), τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος (Eph. iv. 3), ἑαυτόν (1 Jno. v. 18). Hence to preserve [keep in safety] (*observare, servare*) from loss, danger, injury. Fear, selfishness, hatred or love may be the motives of such preserving; the object of τηρεῖν enables us to infer the motive. *His* commandments=the commandments of *God the Father;* for the reference to Christ here is valid not so much because He gave commandments as because He kept them (cf. v. 6). *To keep the commandments* is not the same as ἐν φωτὶ περιπατεῖν (ch. i. 7), but an indispensable part of it, and moreover a distinct, cognizable part of the greater, wide and profound whole, and as a sign or token peculiarly fitted to mark a conclusion. The commandments of God are clear, simple, well-defined; the expression of His will, given as much for His glory as for our salvation, evidences of His holy love, of His sanctifying compassion, and of His salutary righteousness; they answer to His Being, and in like manner to the nature of His Law, and particularly to the nature of His creatures. If they originate in the love of God, the motive of obedience to them must also be the love of God, who gave them, and the love of themselves as the gifts of His love. But the words themselves do not warrant the opinion of Augustine and Bede, that John insists here upon love. He only demands the unexceptional keeping of the commandments of God, and by the use of the Article and the Plural (τὰς ἐντολὰς), excludes any and every arbitrary selection. He lays down a sure and infallible token; and the erroneous view just stated proves it to be such. But he does not lay down this keeping as a fact by the use of ὅτι, but as a supposition by ἐὰν; with this agrees also the choice of the word τηρεῖν instead of ποιεῖν (which is likewise conditioned by the words of our Lord in Matth. xxviii. 20: τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν). We cannot *do*, but only *keep* the commandments of God. And even this is very limited, unsatisfactory, liable to frequent and manifold interruptions. Least of all can it be John's meaning (according to ch. i. 8–10) to suppose Christians capable of fully keeping and practising the commandments of God. But notwith-

5 truth is not in him. But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God
6 perfected[6]: hereby know we that we are in him. He that saith he abideth in him
7 ought himself also so[7] to walk, even as he walked. Brethren,[8] I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning
The old commandment is the word which ye have heard from the beginning.[9]
8 Again, a new commandment I write unto you, which thing is true in him and in
9 you;[10] because the darkness is past,[11] and the true light now shineth. He that saith
10 he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in[12] darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in
11 him.[13] But he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that[14] darkness hath blinded his eyes.

Verse 3. [[1] German: "And hereby we know;" the emphatic *do* know in E. V. suggests an idea foreign from the text. —M].

[[2] German: "That we *have* known him." Lillie: "Have attained to this knowledge." Where knowledge is spoken of *merely* as present, γνώσκω. or οἶδα is used, not ἔγνωκα. See John's epistles *passim*.—E.V. vv. 13, 14; ch. iii. 6; iv. 16; 2 John i., and generally elsewhere."—M.].

[3] Cod. Sin. has φυλάξωμεν for τηρῶμεν; which is, however, given as well. The future by no means suits the Apostle's thought.

Verse 4. [4] A. B. Cod. Sin. al. insert ὅτι before ἔγνωκα. John usually employs the *oratio indirecta* with the *infin.*, as in vv. 6. 9; ch. i. 6, or *temp. fin.* with ὅτι, as in ch. i. 8, 10. The *oratio directa* with ὅτι occurs only in one other place, ch. iv. 20. It is difficult to understand why ὅτι should have been introduced here from there. [Rather: ὅτι was possibly omitted by later transcribers, on account of the difficulty it presented.—M.].

[[5] German: "I *have* known Him," ἔγνωκα see above on v. 3, note 2—M.].

Verse 5. [[6] German: "In such an one the love of God is truly perfected." Lillie: "Truly in this man hath the love of God been perfected."—M.].

Verse 6. [7] C. Cod. Sin. insert οὕτως before περιπατεῖν. There is no reason why it should be inserted, although it might have seemed superfluous to some. [It is wanting in A. B. Vulg.—M.] It renders the thought very emphatic.

Verse 7. [[8] German: "*Beloved*" M.] ἀδελφοί, Oecum, Mill, Wetstein, is weakly supported; ἀγαπητοί is manifestly the correct reading [A. B. C. Cod. Sin. Syr. Vulg. Griesb. Bengel, al. sustain it.—M.].

[[9] German omits the words "from the beginning," at the close of the verse. The corresponding ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, omitted by A. B. C. Sin. al., are cancelled by Lachm., Tischend., Buttm., Theile.—M.].

Verse 8. [10] ὑμῖν, B. C. Cod. Sin., although the more difficult reading, is better authenticated than ἡμῖν (A.)

[11] σκιά instead of σκοτία lacks the weight of authority, and is clear as to its tendency or origin from the contrast between the economy of the Old and New Testaments.

[German: "Passeth away," παράγεται. The Present should by all means be retained. German: already, ἤδη, better than *now*.—M.].

Verse 9. [[12] German: "*The* darkness," ἡ σκοτία, both here and below in v. 11. The omission of the Article in E. V. obscures the sense.—M.].

Verse 10. [[13] German: "An offence" or "stumbling-block is not in him."—M.].

Verse 11. [[14] German: "The darkness;" "because that darkness" (E. V.) is perplexing and ambiguous, better retain the more correct rendering, "because *the* darkness," ὅτι ἡ σκοτία. German: "where he goeth to." —M.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The Connection. The call to the contest with sin on the ground of the Saviour's antecedent propitiation and lasting intercession is connected with this section of the mark of the true knowledge of and fellowship with God, as that of vital Christianity: see whether thou really art the object of the intercession of the Sinless One with Him who is Light! The *mala securitas* and the *utilis timor* move the Apostle to set this section with the given marks of a true Christian into close connection with the immediately preceding section of the atonement for the sins of the *whole* world, and namely, as a link in the chain of thoughts depending on v. 5.: "That God is Light." His object is to excite a salutary, moral seriousness of purpose in his readers; their obedience to the commandments of God, and especially their practice of brotherly love are given to them as tokens by which they may determine whether they are really in God's kingdom of grace. He warns, therefore, "against the false security of a show-Christianity," and guards his churches "against false confidence and carnal security" (Neander); similar are the views of the greater number of commentators, from Episcopius and Calov down to Düsterdieck, who, however, confines himself to pointing out the dependence of this section also on the leading thought in ch. i. 5, 6, while the former take too narrow views of the connection with ch. ii. 1, 2. The copula καί denotes the close connection and appurtenance of the sequel to the preceding section. Hence it is not correct to make here the beginning of a new section, (Sander: "Having thus far spoken of the proofs of salvation, he now proceeds to exhort his readers to its preservation"), or to connect with ch. i. 5, 6 (Huther).

Obedience to the commandments of God is the general characteristic of true Christianity. (v.v. 3–6).

VER. 3. **And hereby we know.**—John uses ἐν τούτῳ in order to refer to the sequel, as here, ch. iii. 16, 19, 24; iv. 9, 10, 13, 17; v. 2, or to the preceding, as in v. 5: iii. 10; the reference is generally plain from the context. In the former case the Apostle is wont to indicate the mark *whereby* we know, by the addition of the preposition ἐκ (iv. 13), or by ὅτι (ch. iii. 16, 19; iv. 9, 10), or ἵνα (ch. iv. 17), or ἐάν (vv. 3, 5), or ὅταν (ch. v. 2), according as he wants to supply either "a really existing, historically given and objectively sure token" (Düsterdieck), on one only ideally existing and described as possible or conditional. The Apostle, who lays a strong emphasis on *knowing*, understands to express in writing the different shades of thought with the same nicety and correctness. ["John uses the formula ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν first as referring the demonstrative pronoun back to what has gone before, as *e. g.* in our v. 5, and in ch. iii. 10. If, however, the demonstrative pronoun in this or a like formula, looks onward, and the token itself, with the cir-

cumstance of which it is a token, follows, he expresses this token variously and significantly, according to the various shades of meaning to be conveyed. Sometimes the token implied in the demonstrative, follows in a separate sentence, as in ch. iv. 2; sometimes the construction is slightly changed, and the sentence begun with ἐν τούτῳ is not regularly brought to a close, but continued in a new and correlative form; *e. g.* ch. iii. 24, where ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν is taken up by ἐκ τοῦ πν. And this way of expression is closely parallel to that where ὅτι completes the construction begun with ἐν τούτῳ. So ch. iii. 16, 19; iv. 9, 10, 13. In these cases the full objective reality of the token, as a fact, is set forth. It is an undoubted fact that He has given us of His Spirit, that He has sent His Son: and from these facts our inference is secure to the other facts in question, that He abideth in us, etc. But in other passages we find instead of this ὅτι an ἵνα, ch. iv. 17, or an ἐὰν, as here, John xiii. 35, or ὅταν, ch. v. 2. This ἐὰν, ὅταν, mark the token implied in ἐν τούτῳ as one not actually existent, an historical or objectively certain fact; but as a possible contingency, something hypothetically and conditionally assumed: in other words as ideal." Düsterdieck, pp. 172, sq.—M.]. He is concerned with the fact,

That we have known Him.—The context must determine who is meant by αὐτὸν, God the Father or Christ; the reason must be sought in the section itself, where in vv. 3–6 we have first the repeated forms αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ and αὐτὸν and once ἐκεῖνος, v. 6. As the latter evidently denotes Christ, so the former applies with equal certainty to God the Father. Hence it was not the immediately preceding verse in which Christ is spoken of, which induced the Apostle to use αὐτὸν and to understand thereby the Father, but rather the all-controlling thought, "God is Light," ch. i. 5. —So Bede, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Lücke, Jachmann, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Brückner, Düsterdieck, Huther, Ebrard. It is referred to Christ by Augustine, Episcopius, Grotius, Luther, Calov, Wolf, Lange, Sander, Neander. Socinus and Calvin are undecided. The word γινώσκειν, occurring twice in juxtaposition, bears each time substantially the same meaning: *to know*. But to know God is not a matter of the understanding only, a knowledge, a knowing, but matter of the whole man; it is an inward life, both matter of the will and of the mind; an entering into, a perceiving in order to be penetrated thereby, in order to receive it in receptivity. The object of this knowing becomes the substance of him that knows; the nature of the object of our knowing determines His coming near us and entering into relationship with us. God cannot be known without Himself; it is only by converse with Him that He allows Himself to be known (Oecumenius; συνεκράθημεν αὐτῷ, Clarius "*societatem habemus cum eo.*"); the knowledge of God presupposes and promotes life-fellowship with Him. This last particular is also intimated by the perfect ἐγνώκαμεν; the real fact of having known Him is described as finished, attended by an after-effect and still further development in continued and ever-growing knowledge; it is parallel to κοινωνίαν ἔχειν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, ch. i. 6. Col. 3. "Inward affinity of life, real appurtenance is the unconditional pre-supposition both of knowing and loving; for only those in affinity with each other know and love each other" (Düsterdieck). *We*, the Christians, renewed in Christ, created to His image, are those who know. Hence it is false to take γινώσκειν like the Hebrew יָדַע in the sense of to *love* (Carpzov, S. G. Lange), or only as a theoretical understanding of Divine truth (Socinus, Episcopius); nor may we intermingle knowledge and love, and regard the latter as essential to the former (Bede, Oecumenius, Lücke), although knowledge is conditioned by love (de Wette).—[It is not mere theoretical knowledge, but vital, experimental knowledge flowing from God, being received into the heart, and His influencing our thoughts, our will and our actions. —M.].

If we keep His Commandments.—The verb τηρεῖν, probably connected with τέρας, [more probably with τήρος, a watch, M.], a sign, denotes properly to pay attention, to observe, ἄνεμον (Eccl. xi. 4), τὴν φυλακὴν (Acts xii. 6), the beloved disciples (Jno. xvii. 11, sqq.), τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος (Eph. iv. 3), ἑαυτόν (1 Jno. v. 18). Hence to preserve [keep in safety] (*observare, servare*) from loss, danger, injury. Fear, selfishness, hatred or love may be the motives of such preserving; the object of τηρεῖν enables us to infer the motive. *His* commandments=the commandments of *God the Father;* for the reference to Christ here is valid not so much because He gave commandments as because He kept them (cf. v. 6). *To keep the commandments* is not the same as ἐν φωτὶ περιπατεῖν (ch. i. 7), but an indispensable part of it, and moreover a distinct, cognizable part of the greater, wide and profound whole, and as a sign or token peculiarly fitted to mark a conclusion. The commandments of God are clear, simple, well-defined; the expression of His will, given as much for His glory as for our salvation, evidences of His holy love, of His sanctifying compassion, and of His salutary righteousness; they answer to His Being, and in like manner to the nature of His Law, and particularly to the nature of His creatures. If they originate in the love of God, the motive of obedience to them must also be the love of God, who gave them, and the love of themselves as the gifts of His love. But the words themselves do not warrant the opinion of Augustine and Bede, that John insists here upon love. He only demands the unexceptional keeping of the commandments of God, and by the use of the Article and the Plural (τὰς ἐντολὰς), excludes any and every arbitrary selection. He lays down a sure and infallible token; and the erroneous view just stated proves it to be such. But he does not lay down this keeping as a fact by the use of ὅτι, but as a supposition by ἐὰν; with this agrees also the choice of the word τηρεῖν instead of ποιεῖν (which is likewise conditioned by the words of our Lord in Matth. xxviii. 20: τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν). We cannot *do*, but only *keep* the commandments of God. And even this is very limited, unsatisfactory, liable to frequent and manifold interruptions. Least of all can it be John's meaning (according to ch. i. 8–10) to suppose Christians capable of fully keeping and practising the commandments of God. But notwith-

standing all the shortcomings of obedience to the commandments of God, and despite all the imperfections and sins of Christians and their life, there still remains a sharp contrast between those who remember the commandments of God to do them (Ps. ciii. 18), and those who do not mind them at all, or only know them. However great may be the difference of believers among themselves, their knowledge of God and their obedience to the commandments of God will be reciprocally related, and the latter will always remain a sure token of the former, which cannot be a fact in the life of Christians without the latter. On that account the Apostle, as is his wont, (as in ch. i. 8, 9), gives prominence to the opposite with a progression in the thought and by way of explanation. [Huther thinks it note-worthy that John never designates the Christian commandments by νόμος, a term used by him *only* with reference to the Mosaic code of laws, but mostly by ἐντολαί (only occasionally λόγος θεοῦ, or χριστοῦ); nor by the verb ποιεῖν (except in Rev. xxii. 14), but τηρεῖν. Paul uses the term τηρεῖν ἐντολήν only at 1 Tim. vi. 11; it occurs besides in the N. T. at Matth. xix. 17 (cf. ch. xxviii. 20). M.].

VER. 4. **He that saith I have known Him, and keepeth not His commandments, is a liar.**—The progression in the development and unfolding of the thought lies in the Singular, which sets it forth not as indefinitely general, but as general and true in its application to each individual. It lies moreover in the negative form, so that we may and must not only infer the knowledge of God from the keeping of God's commandments, and from other facts as well, but that the keeping of the Divine commandments, obedience, cannot and must not be wanting where there is a knowledge of God, which deserves that name. The words "*he is a liar*," moreover, are intensive and stronger than "he lies" (ch. i. 6), or "he deceives himself" (ch. i. 8). Not a single act, but his whole nature and being, is thus designated; the *lie* reigns in him. There may first of all be wanting self-examination in the light of divine truth, or it may be self-deception and unconscious hypocrisy, but the conscious lie will follow; one *desires* to appear more than one is. The further particular,

And the truth is not in him, gives emphatic prominence to the status, the emptiness of such a person, cf. ad. ch. i. 8, in *Exegetical and Critical.*

VER. 5, similar to ch. i, 8—10, in antithesis with v. 4, refers back to v. 3, by δὲ, but progressing both in the subject-clause and in the predicate-clause.

But whoso keepeth His word; literally: "*but whoso keepeth of Him the word.*"—Τηρῇ, keepeth, stands emphatically first, so αὐτοῦ precedes τὸν λόγον, and λόγον instead of the manifold ἐντολαί, in order to mark the unity. "*Præcepta multa, verbum unum,*" observes Bengel, and a Lapide correctly says: "*Dicit verbum ejus in singulari, quia præcipue respicit legem caritatis: enim ceteras omnes in se comprehendit.*" Hence ὁ λόγος is not the synonym of αἱ ἐντολαί (Huther), nor the comforting message of the gospel, nor the requirement of faith, but the revelation of the will of God as a unit, or the revelation of His commandments in their relation as a unit to His purpose of grace (Ebrard). As this sentence corresponds with "if we keep His commandments" (v. 3), and is more definite by the *pron. rel.* than is the other sentence by ἐὰν, so the ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτὸν is parallel with ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ τετελείωται. It matters not how much we distinguish *knowledge* and *love*, and warn against their being confounded, they are nevertheless intrinsically connected and correlatives: "*Amor præsupponit cognitionem*" [says Grotius, which Huther admits, and adds M.]: "*Cognitio præsupponit amorem.*" Both are true. From this it is evident both that we must apply αὐτὸν, v. 3, to God the Father, and that ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ must denote *our love of God* (as ch. ii. 15; iii. 17; iv. 12; v. 3.) *The knowledge of God* and *the love to God* must correspond with each other. This is the view of the majority of commentators, viz.: Bede, Oecumenius, Luther, Beza, Lorinus, Socinus, Grotius, S. G. Lange, Lücke, Jachmann, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Brückner, Neander, Huther, Düsterdieck, and others. Others (Flacius, S. Schmid, Calov, J. Lange, Bengel, Sander), understand the *love of God to us* (as in ch. iv, 9, 10), first in opposition to the Romish exposition of the meritorious *perfectio caritatis nostræ aut operum nostrorum*, and secondly on account of τετελείωται, which, they say, cannot be predicated of our love. But neither is it "the love commanded by God" (Episcopius) in which we have to exercise ourselves, nor the relation of reciprocal love between God and man, the *communio, societas* and *conjunctio, mutua amicitia et conjunctio* (Ebrard following several commentators, chiefly [German] Reformed), nor "*the love of God in us*, comprising both *God's love to us, through* which, and *our* love *to God*, in which we live." (Besser.) The explanation of τετελείωται, *is perfected, perfect*, is difficult. We have no right to dilute the word with *Beza*, as if John were speaking not of a *perfecta caritas*, but of an *adimpleta caritas*, without all show and hypocrisy, so that the reference were only to *sincere* love and τελειοῦν were only *mettre en exécution* [to put into execution.—M.]. Nor can it be right to hold with Socinus and his successors, the rationalists, that the reference is to a relative perfection adapted to the powers of man, because ἀληθῶς prohibits such an interpretation. It signifies, as in ch. iv. 12, 17, 18, *perfected, has become perfect.* "John supposes the case that somebody really keeps the word of God, and from this ideal stand-point says with the fullest right that such a keeping of the Divine commandments evidences a perfected love to God in practice (cf. Lücke). The more the ideal keeping of the sentence becomes apparent to us, so much the more do we perceive in it a paracletical power, an incentive to the realization of that ideal, a holding up of Christian duty, ὀφείλει, v. 6." (Düsterdieck). Calvin says: "*Si quis objiciat, neminem unquam fuisse repertum, qui deum ita perfecte diligeret, respondeo, sufficere, modo quisque pro gratia sibi datæ mensura ad hanc perfectionem adspiret. Interim constat definitio, quod perfectus dei amor sit legitima sermonis ejus observatio. In ea nos progredi sicut in notitia proficere decet.*" But Huther is perfectly right in his strictures of Calvin's view which approaches that of Socinus, who says: "*Est autem perfectio ista caritatis in Deum et obedientia præceptorum ejus ita intelligenda, ut non*

omnino requiratur, ne ei quicquam deesse possit, sed tantum ut ejusmodi sit, qua Deus pro sua ingenti erga nos bonitate contentus esse voluit."—M.]. "Where the word of God is perfectly fulfilled, there the love to God is perfect; perfect love shows itself in perfect obedience. It is certainly true that the Christian at no moment of his life has reached this perfection, but is always only growing in that direction. John, however, does not refer to that here." The Apostle now quickly subjoins the concluding thought: **Hereby** (not "by the perfection of love" (Socinus), but "by obedience to the commandments of God," Huther, Ebrard; for this thought concerning obedience as the token of the knowledge of God and of life-fellowship with Him governs this whole thought-complex) **we know that we are in Him.** Ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμέν is the final and summary expression of ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν, v. 3, and of κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' αὐτοῦ, ch. i. 6, of the inward life-fellowship of *Christians* with God. It is more than *man's* dependence on God in virtue of his inward relation to Him (as in Acts xvii. 28). As having known Him is not without *being in Him*, obedience of His commandments must stand as the mark of the knowledge of God, while the love of God [i. e., our love to God, M.] must supervene. What is said here amounts therefore to more than the explanation given by Grotius: "*Christi ingenii discipuli sumus.*"

Ver. 6 is the final and full conclusion of this section.

He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also so to walk.—First: "*Synonyma, cum gradatione:* Illum nosse, in Illo esse in Illo manere, *cognitio, communio, constantia,*" (Bengel); then ἐντολὰς τηρεῖν, τὸν λόγον, περιπατεῖν καθὼς ἐκεῖνος. Ἐν αὐτῷ, particularly by the side of ἐκεῖνος (Jesus), and different from it, evidently denotes God the Father, and not Christ, as maintained by Augustine, Wolf, Neander, al., although the recollection of μένειν, the favourite expression of Jesus, which occurs ten times in John xv. 4-11, may have influenced the language of the Apostle in this passage; at all events, the *abiding* spoken of in the Gospel is also connected with a reference to the commandments. "*Being* and *abiding* in God denote one and the same fellowship with God. The latter term merely superadds the description of its *permanence* and *continuance*, which is not contained in the former." (Frommann.)

Ought (ὀφείλει) does not designate a mark or sign, but only the *obligation*.

So to walk even as He walked.—(*i. e.* Christ). This walking is not a mark or sign, which exists or might exist, or given as a touchstone to determine the Christianity of individuals, but simply designates the duty and obligation of Christians, as the disciples of Christ. Nor is it consequently a moment of *abiding* or *being* in God, a part thereof, but a goal to be reached, and a problem to be solved by every Christian, with the obligation of which none may dispense. So (οὕτως) to walk as Christ walked—is a requirement, compliance with which involves constant learning and ceaseless labour. The reference to Christ by καθὼς ἐκεῖνος occurs several times in this Epistle, ch. iii. 3, 7; iv. 17.

As He walked points neither to particular traits in the life of Christ, *e. g.* prayer for His enemies (Augustine), contempt of the world and its pleasures, and patience in sufferings (Bede), nor, as in 1 Pet. ii. 21, sqq., to His self-humiliation and suffering, nor only to His perfect obedience of the commandments of God, nor to His doing only; but it is the concrete representation of walking in the Light (ch. i. 7), of the Divine life in Christ, whose essence and kernel is love. So that Paul may even exhort us to *imitate, copy, follow God* (Eph. v. 1,) and *to walk in love* (v. 2). But this must not be confined to the inward disposition, but must have an adequate expression in all our doings, in our whole conduct, at every step of our life; hence περιπατεῖν. John and his mysticism are certainly not afflicted with sentimentalism. The emphatic οὕτως can hardly be dispensed with here [See Appar. Crit. v. 6, note 7.—M.].

Brotherly love in particular is now specified as a mark of true Christianity (vv. 7-11).

Ver. 7. **Beloved,** so in ch. iii. 2, 21; iv. 1, 7, 11; in the last two passages it is particularly connected with the commandment of brotherly love. *Beloved* of God the Father in Christ, whom they ought to follow in that they walk in love to the brethren, as He did. [Huther: "Such an address does not necessarily indicate a new paragraph, but it bursts forth also in cases when the matter in question is to be brought home to the hearts of readers or hearers; which is the case here."—M.].

I write not a new commandment to you.—The whole context, both what immediately precedes and what follows, requires us to regard this ἐντολή as a *commandment*, even as the commandment of *brotherly love*. The consideration of v. 6 teaches first that ὀφείλει constrains us to hold fast to the meaning of ἐντολή, *commandment*, and secondly exhorts us to walking after Christ; while v. 9 treats of love to the brethren. The latter is the definite and explicit declaration of what is implied in the former. It is improper to say that the reference here is to the different commandments; the commandment, to walk after Christ, and the commandment, to love the brethren; the two commandments are not *alongside* one another, but *inside* one another, and so that the latter is included in the former, not *vice versa*, that consequently the former is more general and less definite than the latter, whereas the latter is particular and clearly defined [*i. e.* Walking after Christ is the general, loving the brethren the particular.—M.]. A separation is impossible here; nor must vv. 7-11 be subdivided as if vv. 7, 8 treated of something different from vv. 9-11. That which is stated in such explicit and definite terms in the second half, with reference to the first half of the whole section, must be already contained and intimated in the first half. The argument proceeds from the *formal*, as given in the walk of Christ, to the *material* which is contained therein. The connection is supported by the Apostle's mode of treatment. For in ch. iii. 11, 23; iv. 7, 21, he uniformly passes from general precepts to the commandment of love. Jno. xv. 13, 17, and particularly ch. xiii. 34, present an analogy, and supply the basis for this part of the Epistle. 2 Jno. 4-6 is the perfect parallel passage which specifies walking in truth, walking after His commandments, walking in the new comandments, which we had from the be-

ginning, and which they had heard. The corresponding points here are walking in the light, walking as He walked, after the commandments of God, in love of the brethren. But the reference cannot by any means be to walking after Christ *per se* in v. 6, because just there the ἐντολή is described as ὁ λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε. The commandment given is therefore, not Christ's *walk* which is *seen*, but His *Word*, which is *heard;* the commandment was not only given in acts, but *spoken* in the word. Of course we must not understand ὁ λόγος as designating the Gospel which is preached, and make it the ἐντολή. Lastly, the general grammatical usage forces us to take ἐντολή [in its usual sense—M.] as *commandment*, and not in the sense of doctrine or truth, as Flacius, Calov, J. Lange, Rickli, Ebrard understand it. We ought therefore to agree with Augustine, Bede, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Neander, Sander, Huther and Düsterdieck, who understand the commandment of brotherly love, and not with expositors like Beza, Socinus, Episcopius, Lücke, Frommann and others, who hold that the commandment applies only to walking after Christ. [It is doubtful whether Braune's view of the relation between *walking after Christ* and *loving the brethren* is correct. It strikes me that the case is stated with greater lucidity and correctness by Huther, who says with reference to the two views of the commentators: "These two views seem to be opposed to each other, but they *are* opposed only when it is assumed that John's design was to specify a particular commandment in contradistinction from other commandments. But that assumption is erroneous: the commandment to keep the commandments (or the word) of God after the pattern of Christ, or to walk in the Light, is none other than that of loving one's brother. From ch. i. 5, onwards John does not refer to different commandments, but to a general commandment of the Christian life, which flows from the truth that God is Light. The reference is to this commandment when John, in order to bring the matter right home to the hearts of his readers, says: οὐκ ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, so that ἐντολή does not refer to a commandment he is about to specify, but to the commandment he had already specified before (however, not in v. 6 *only*), and which he is about to define more clearly in the sequel as its *concrete* substance." This view Huther pronounces in agreement with that of Düsterdieck: "The solution of the riddle is . . . . that the holy commandment to walk as Christ did walk, is fully and essentially contained in the commandment of brotherly love." "We encounter here the view that as the whole exemplary life of Christ is contained in His love of us, so our whole walk in the Light is substantially nothing else than following after Christ in this full brotherly love."—M.].

The words "*not a new commandment*" are explained by what follows:

But an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning; this old commandment is the word which ye heard.—The commandment, therefore, is not *new*, but *old*, because the readers do not only now learn to know it by his writing, (γράφω), but because they have it already, and had it *from the beginning*. It is also said how they did receive it; they had *heard* it, that is, it had been announced to them. This renders it necessary to refer ἀπ' ἀρχῆς to the beginning of Christianity, and the Christian standing of the readers; for the beginning, as far it concerns their life, cannot be anterior to their time, but must coincide with their life and the time when it was announced to them. So, also. v. 24; ch. iii. 11; 2 Jno. 5, 6. *Ye* can never mean *majores vestri* (Grotius), but designates the readers themselves, the Church, to whom the Epistle is addressed. Nor is there room for a distinction between Jewish Christians who had it already formerly, and Gentile Christians who had only heard it by the preaching of the Gospel, as Wolf draws it, and for saying that the beginning in the case of the former denotes what is written in the Old Testament by Moses (Flacius, Clarius), and that in the case of the latter the beginning dates even from the creation, written in their heart and conscience (the Greeks, fully corresponding with what Luthardt, *on free-will*, p. 12, sq., 22, observes as a characteristic of the Greek Church which is fond of connecting Christianity with the sphere of the universally *human* as contradistinguished from the Latin Church, which prefers to give prominence to the specific newness of the *Christian*, Baumgarten-Crusius, Credner). But we must not say that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς bears precisely the same meaning as in ch. i. 1; ii. 13, 14; iii. 8, since the meaning is determined by the context, which points here to the beginning of the Christian life. This is the view of most commentators, viz.: Calvin, Beza, Socinus, Episcopius, Lange, Rickli, Lücke, de Wette, Sander, Neander, Besser, Düsterdieck, Huther and al.—The Article in the addition (ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ παλαιά) marks once more the age of the commandment which had already been indicated by the antithesis (οὐκ-καινήν, ἀλλὰ παλαιάν). It is called straightforth ὁ λόγος, ὃν ἠκούσατε, because, as all ἐντολαὶ run together in the one ἐντολή, as this one ἐντολή runs through and fills the whole λόγος, the evangelical ἀγγελία: "We should love one another as Christ has loved us;" wherefore ὁ λόγος is not the chief substance of the word, but the word itself. As εἴχετε meant that they had, knew and used the commandment, so ἠκούσατε adds how they came to possess it: by the preaching of the Apostles. The addition is, therefore, not a correction of γράφω, as if John wanted to say: it is not I that give it to you now while I am writing, but you have heard it long ago of Christ (Baumgarten-Crusius), [for ἠκουσάτε has no immediate relation to γράφω, but to εἴχετε.—M.].

VER. 8. **Again I write unto you.**—Πάλιν indicates a close connection with the preceding verse, rendered unmistakable by the repetition of the same word in the same form: γράφω, v. 7,—πάλιν belongs to the verb (Lücke, de Wette), although ἐντολὴν καινὴν stands before γράφω, and signifies *again*, once more, a second time, and Erasmus, with whom most commentators agree here, is not wrong in saying (against Huther): "*et contrarietatem declarat et iterationem*," because πάλιν is used by Homer and Hesiod in the sense of *back, backward*, and *against*, πάλιν ἐρεῖν to *gainsay* [*i. e.*, say *against*—M.], but in Herodotus and Attic, and later writers generally, it bears almost

the exclusive signification of *again*, *once more*, *anew*; but Erasmus errs when he adds: "*hic non repetitionis sed contrarietatis est declaratio;*" it is here corrective and epanorthotic (Beza, Episcopius, Calov, Wolf, Lücke, al.).—Γράφω, both here and in v. 7, denotes the present act of the Apostle, and has its ordinary, literal sense, not=I *pre*scribe (Baumgarten-Crusius), nor does the Accusative following γράφω admit the construction =I write *of*, *concerning* the commandment.

[As] a new commandment, which thing is true in Him and in you.—[Knapp's paraphrase πάλιν (ὡς) ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν (τοῦτο) ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθές is the basis of *as* bracketed in the text.—M.].—This is a further proof of the close connection of this verse with v. 7; John adheres to what he had just said, writes still on the same point, and it is, therefore, simply impossible to make v. 8 begin a *new* paragraph, as does Ebrard. The clause ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς relates to the preceding matter, as is evident from the relative pronoun, and cannot be connected with the following clause introduced by ὅτι, as Ebrard thinks. The Neuter forbids our regarding it as a relative clause belonging to καινὴ ἐντολή, as maintained by Düsterdieck, who assumes a *constructio ad sensum*, and says that "the real substance of ἐντολή is declared to be true, both in Christ and in the readers," but this would require ἡ—ἀληθής (Lücke), and "the thing required by ἐντολή is nothing else but the ἐντολή itself" (Ebrard). We must take it rather as coördinated with ἐντολὴν καινήν, and construe it like ἐντολὴν καινήν, as the object of γράφω. The above-mentioned paraphrase of Knapp is the most simple construction, although we must not attach to the inserted ὡς the meaning of "*tanquam si nova esset*," as Knapp does, for then it could not be called a new commandment; yet both the Apostle and our Lord Himself describe it by the epithet *new* (Jno. xiii. 34); ὡς, moreover, denotes the reality (Rom. xv. 15, and elsewhere), and is well adapted to being supplied, in order to point out the right explanation.—But we have to begin with the explanation of ὅ ἐστιν, which stands emphatically first; the reference is consequently to that, *which is—in Him and in you.* Αὐτός by the side of ὑμῖν denotes a person, so that ἐν αὐτῷ is not =*per se ac simpliciter* (Socinus), and the context requires its being explained of Christ and not of God (Jachmann, who is then compelled to understand ἀληθὲς in connection with ἐν αὐτῷ, in a different sense from the same word in connection with ἐν ὑμῖν; *in God* it has its reason, *in you* it has its evidence). There is no reason why the preposition should be rendered *respectu*, in respect of, or *by* (which something may be known, identified as true, de Wette); it simply means: *in* or *with* Christ and you. At the same time ἀληθὲς bears of course the sense of *real*, as in Acts xii. 9 [*i. e.*, it denotes *actual reality* (Huther, Meyer)—M.]. The sentence, moreover, must not be torn to pieces after the manner of Erasmus, Episcopius and Grotius: "*quod verum est in illo, id etiam in vobis verum est, esse debet.*" But brotherly love evidenced in the walk is true in Christ the Head and in the readers of the Epistle, as the members of His Body. No matter how great the difference of that reality may be, it is still there [is actually, really extant.—M.]. This stands as a *new* commandment, and, therefore, John writes it thus. He considers the ἐντολή as the main point, places it first, and then predicates of it that it is *new*, after having previously called it *old*.—He called it *old* from the stand-point of the present with regard to the former entrance into Christianity, which took place long ago; he describes as new that which is true in Christ and His people, and sees first in Him what is now also in His people, what Christ required of His followers as a new commandment (Jno. xiii. 34), and from this stand-point, from their entrance into Christianity and their fellowship with Christ, he, like the Lord Himself, calls this a commandment which is *new*. The Apostle consequently does not refer here to the permanent duration of the commandment of brotherly love, which requires to be constantly inculcated anew (Calvin: "*perpetuo vigere,*" Socinus, Knapp, al.), nor to man's new birth (Augustine, Bede, al.). It is new by the very words added by Christ Himself in Jno. xiii. 34: "καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς," as He has proved it in fact, and as he does effect and operate it in His people. [Huther: "The sense is: that which is already true, *i. e.*, a reality, in Christ and in you, to wit: the τηρεῖν τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Jno. xv. 10, where Christ says of Himself: ἐγὼ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ πατρός μου τετήρηκα), I write to you as a new commandment," and then he adds in a foot-note, "It is manifestly not more surprising that John sets up before his readers anew as a commandment that which has already become a reality in them, than that he announces to them truths, of which he says himself that they know them already."—M.].

Because the darkness passeth away and the true light shineth already.—This sentence answers the question: Why does the Apostle write as a commandment which is new that which is true in Him and the readers of the Epistle? Hence ὅτι is simply causal, *because;* and this whole sentence corresponds exactly with the preceding (Düsterdieck, Huther). Ὅτι, consequently, is not merely dependent on ἀληθές or ἐντολή (Socinus, Bengel, Ebrard), so that it has declarative force=*that;* the point is not to prove that the light shineth and that the darkness passeth away, nor could that be the substance of a commandment. Nor can we divide (with Lücke and Brückner) the sentence that the commandment of walking in the light manifests itself as *new* in Christ (in whom the true light has appeared), and in the readers (in whom this light diffuses itself and shines already, scattering the darkness), and refer the former to ἐν αὐτῷ, which is not said at all, or to τὸ φῶς φαίνει, and the latter to ἐν ἡμῖν or ἡ σκοτία παράγεται. We have no occasion or warrant for doing so. The antitheses ἡ σκοτία and τὸ φῶς ἀληθινόν must be taken in an ethical sense, and denote the sinful and the holy, as the elements in which one lives and walks; and this construction is rendered necessary by the subsequent verses and the whole context. Both are opposed to each other, but they exist alongside each other, increasing or decreasing (παράγεται—ἤδη φαίνει). The former consequently does not denote the economy of the Old Testament or paganism, which indeed were never without light, nor the latter only the per-

son of Christ, as in John i. 9 (Oecumenius, Bengel), nor "*Christus una cum doctrina ejus et effectus fide et caritate*" (Lange); for the expression has a wider reach. The σκοτία denotes the whole power and sphere of the ethical life, separate from communion with God (the Light in Whom there is no darkness), still fighting against the Light, but evermore condemned (Jno. iii. 19), constantly overcome and consuming itself; but the Light, which is God (ch. i. 5), embraces whatever belongs to His Kingdom, and keeps believers in communion with Himself (Düsterdieck). The Light is called τὸ ἀληθινόν, which is not only real (ἀληθὲς), but the true light answering to the real truth, embracing and effecting the real truth. (Ibid.) [Eternal, essential Light, of which earthly light is only a transitory image.—Huther, Neander.—M.]. So Luke xvi. 11; 1 Thess. i. 9. It is just the life of the Lord, wherein *is* that which shines, bursts and shines forth with ever increasing strength; this real Being is the Light, the true Light (John i. 4). In παράγεται we have first of all to preserve the Present form. The Vulgate renders falsely "*tenebræ transierunt;*" so do Luther, "is past," Calvin [and E. V. "is past"—M.]. It is unnecessary to construe it passively with Besser, Sander, Bengel, (*traducitur, commutatur, ita ut tandem absorbeatur*); it is Middle, like παράγει, 1 Cor. vii. 31 (so Oecumenius, Wolf, Lücke, de Wette, Düsterdieck, Huther): it is passing away, vanishing, disappearing. With this corresponds ἤδη φαίνει, said of the Light, it shineth, *shineth already*, not *now* (Luther, E. V.); the darkness makes room for the light, the light begins already to break through. [Huther, who adds, "so that neither the darkness is entirely past, nor the light entirely established."—M.]. The transition from the reign of darkness to that of the Light is thus indicated and referred to the future, when the conflict thus begun will end in the full victory of the Light. Hence in the words ὅ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν John expresses not so much an encomium on his church, as a declaration of his joy in the continued working and the commencing and progressing victory of the Lord and His Kingdom. From this point of view the reading ὑμῖν only can be received as authentic, as bringing out the true sense of the passage in an undiluted form, which would certainly be awakened by the reading ἡμῖν, and lessen the Apostle's pure rejoicing over his church, as the work of Jesus Christ. [Rickli: "John says this in relation to the *time* in which they live, and during which the great work of the Lord took a wondrously rapid course of development. The true Light, the Lord in His perfect revelation of Divine truth, *shines already;*—already the great morning dawns for mankind. When the Lord returns, then will be the full day of God. This revelation . . . believers go to meet.—M.].

VER. 9. **He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother.**

For the form cf. v. 4, for the thought see ch. i. 6, 7. Φῶς here denotes neither Christ (Spener), nor the Church (Ebrard: "The Church of those in whom the fact ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἤδη φαίνει has become an ἀληθές"); for since τὸ φῶς, v. 8, denotes the holy, the sphere of the Divine life, no other sense can be admitted here. The Apostle regards as his *brother* particularly the believer in Christ, as γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (ch. v. 1); the love of the brethren, as the children of a loved Father, rests on the love of God, who has regenerated them (ch. v. 1; iii. 10.). Likewise in the Gospel (Jno. iii. 16; xv. 12, sq.; xiii. 34; xx. 17; xxi. 13); St. Peter also gives φιλαδελφία in the same sense (1 Pet. i. 22, sq.), and actually distinguishes it from ἀγάπη which he takes in the sense of φιλανθρωπία (2 Pet. i. 7), (Luther, common love). "*Ipsa appellatio amoris causam continet* (Bengel). Whether ἀδελφὸς denotes elsewhere an actual brother or a cousin, Jno. vii. 3, 5 [see my article "*Are James the son of Alphæus and James the brother of the Lord identical,*" in Princeton Review, January, 1865—M.], or members of the same nationality, Acts xxiii. 1, or=ὁ πλησίον, ὁ ἕτερος, (Matth. xviii. 35; vii. 3; Luke vi. 41; Jas. iv. 11), the context must always determine the sense, and the context here refers decidedly to Christian fellowship. Hence Grotius is wrong: "*sive Judæum, sive alienigenam; fratres omnes in Adamo sumus*"), as well as Calov and Lange [who give a similar exposition.—M.]. It is improper to take μισεῖν as "*post habere, minus diligere, non colere*" (Bretschneider); it means *to hate;* but it is not specified here to which degree of hatred he has come to whom reference is made; it is left undecided whether his hatred be germinating and initial, or mature and fully developed. Not even the faintest degree or colouring of hatred can be compatible with this ἐν τῷ φωτὶ εἶναι. That saying and this hating are so little in agreement, and this hating imports so much more than that saying, that John continues, saying,

Is in the darkness until now—in sin, in the atmosphere of the sinful, *until now, yet*, at this hour, this very moment. But along with all this severity and profound earnestness which insists upon one thing or the other, runs the intimation of a hope of return. [Huther: "Like φῶς and σκοτία, μισεῖν τὸν ἀδελφόν and ἀγαπᾶν τὸν ἀδελφόν mutually exclude each other. They are two diametrically opposed biasses of life; a man's doings belong *either* to the one *or* to the other; that which does not belong to the sphere of the one, appertains to that of the other. Each denial of love is hatred, each conquest of hatred is love." Düsterdieck:—"Nothing can be more shallow and weak as compared with the ethics of the whole Scripture. All the truth, depth, and power of Christian ethics rest on the '*aut . . . aut*,' so distinctly insisted on by St. John. On the one side is God, on the other the world: here is life, there is death; here love, there hate, *i. e.* murder; there is no medium. In the space between, is nothing. Life may as yet be merely elementary and fragmentary. Love may as yet be weak and poor, but still, life in God and its necessary demonstration in love, is present really and truly, and the word of our Lord is true: "He that is not against me is with me," Luke ix. 50; and on the other side, the life according to the flesh, the attachment to the world, and the necessary action of this selfishness by means of hatred, may be much hidden, may be craftily covered, and with splendid outer surface; but in the secret depth of the man, there where spring the real fountains of his moral life, is not God but the world; the man is yet in death, and can consequently love nothing but himself, and must

hate his brother; and then the other word of the Lord is true, "He that is not for me is against me," Luke ix. 23. For a man can only be either for or against Christ, and consequently can only have either love or hate towards his brother."—M.].

VER. 10. **He that loveth his brother, abideth in the light, and a stumbling-block is not in him.**—Not only an antithesis to v. 9, but also a progression in the argument: *μένει*, for every thing depends on the *abiding* which must be the result of *being* cf. v. 6. The sentiment is prepared in ἕως ἄρτι v. 9 by the fine allusion that hatred of the brother and being in the darkness, must be overcome, and that being in the light and in love must be maintained. Hence we cannot say with Ebrard: "The exercise of brotherly love is of itself a means of strengthening and confirming the new life; from brotherly fellowship there flow for the new man refreshing and quickening streams of his faith." But the love of the brother acts and moves within the sphere of light, not without growth which strengthens itself there; the impelling power is that which evinces itself in brotherly love, faith in the Father, faith in the Only Begotten of the Father, who gives us the power to become the children of God. He that loves his brother ever grows more firmly rooted in holiness, the kingdom of light; growth takes place *in* brotherly love, but brotherly love does not produce it; He only produces it who produces fellowship with Himself and the love of the brother. John knows only *aut—aut*, hating or loving: "*ubi non amor est, odium est, cor non est vacuum*" (Bengel). The sentence, σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν fully corresponds with v. 4; ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν. The comparison of these two verses facilitates the understanding of our passage. τὸ σκάνδαλον, or ὁ σκάνδαλος (Hesychius) is [the rendering of the LXX, M.] for מִכְשׁוֹל or מוֹקֵשׁ properly ἐμπόδισμος, σκανδάληθρον (τὸ ἐν ταῖς μυάγραις), πρόσκομμα; hence βάλλειν, τιθέναι σκάνδαλον. So λίθον προσκόμματος, πέτρα σκανδάλου Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 7; cf. Is. viii. 14; xxviii. 16; Rom. xiv. 13. It is always a stumbling against, an offence given, but it is left undefined whether it is given with or without guilt. Christ Himself, the Crucified One, is 1 Cor. i. 23: Ἰουδαίοις σκάνδαλον. The guilt of the σκάνδαλον may reside in him to whom it is given, who takes it, who is offended at it and falls. Here it is said: ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν. In him, who loves his brother and abides in the Light, in the holy, is not σκάνδαλον, is not that which offends, gives offence, causes himself or others to stumble and fall, such as envy, suspicion, want of sympathy, harshness of judgment, pride—all σκάνδαλα to himself and also to others. "*Qui fratrem odit, ipse sibi offendiculum est et incurrit in se ipsum et in omnia intus et foris; qui amat expeditum iter habet.* Bengel. This seems also to be the exposition of Düsterdieck, who says: "Occasion of stumbling and falling, the lust of the flesh is still extant in believers, but they are always sure of the virtue of the blood of Christ which hallows and increasingly removes every σκάνδαλον (ch. i. 7, sqq.). It is inadmissible to explain ἐν αὐτῷ=αὐτῷ, as Grotius does (*est metonymia et ἐν abundat; sensus: ille non impingit.* Ps. cxix. 165), or de Wette (*with him* [for him] there is no offence), or Neander (there is no offence with him, he himself does not stumble) or to explain αὐτῷ with Lücke and Sander of the external sphere of life, because in the case of Christians σκάνδαλα lie in the world, not in himself. What Vatablus says is only half true; *nemini offendiculo est;* the same applies to Johannsen: "he gives no offence; Ebrard: "there is nothing in them whereby they give offence to the brethren; and Huther, "there is nothing in him which becomes an offence to himself:" the reference to others has also been given by Calov, Jachmann, that to himself by Bede, Luther and Calvin.

VER. 11 concludes this section in antithesis to v. 10, taking from that antithesis that which helps the further development of the thought.

But he that hateth his brother is in the darkness and walketh in the darkness.—Here we find περιπατεῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, superadded to εἶναι ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ v. 10. The latter denotes the *status* or *habitus* (Sander), or *affectus* (Grotius) the disposition, state, the former the *actus*, operation; so also de Wette and others. "Both the being (the assumption) and the doing (the consequence) of the unloving belong to the darkness; cf. Gal. v. 25" (Huther). "He that hateth his brother, both as to his *person* and as to his *walk*, belongs to the darkness, the sphere of the sinful" (Ebrard). Closely connected with this is:

And he knoweth not where he goeth to—answering to the σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν, v. 10. The particle ποῦ, *where*, not *whither*, denotes rest; ὑπάγειν however is not *to go*, but to *go away to, to go to;* the word describes a calm walking, not a mere moving to and fro, but a progressive moving towards an end or goal. So Jno. iii. 8; viii. 14; xii. 35; also Jno. vii. 35; ποῦ—πορεύεσθαι; ch. xx. 2, 13; ποῦ ἔθηκαν. The unloving man sees and knows not which way he is going; he walks with darkened eyes on a dark way. Luther ("they fancy that they are going to rest and glory, and yet go to hell"); and Cyprian ("*it nescius in gehennam, ignarus et cæcus præcipitatur in pœnam*") look at the extreme goal, but we should not lose sight of the immediate consequences of a selfish and unloving being and walking. The matter is so very important, that the Apostle substantiates his statement, saying:

Because the darkness hath blinded his eyes.—Τυφλοῦν, to blind, to make blind must not be changed into "surrounding with darkness," or diluted by a *tanquam* (Lücke and others). The unloving man himself is dark, and the darkness is in him, in his eyes, not only round about him. Jno. xii. 40; cf. Is. vi. 9, sq.; Matth. xiii. 14, sq.; and N. pp. Acts xxviii. 26, sq.; also 2 Cor. iv. 4.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Here we see quite plainly the different sides of the Christian life; γιγνώσκειν θεόν, τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρεῖν, τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ τηρεῖν, ἀλήθεια, ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι, μένειν, appear as *correlates.* The *dogmatical* and the *ethical* are in one another. The ethos is contained in the dogma, waiting to be delivered in the life; the ethos rests on the dogma as on a root; both are inwardly related to each other, refer to each other, belong together, may be distinguished, but not

separated; the one without the other falls to ruin or runs to waste. Christian knowledge loses experience, clearness, sharpness of outline, assurance, and breadth, without a life of Christian morality; Christian morality loses unity, depth, endurance, joyfulness, grace and beauty, if not founded on Christian knowledge. If it is affirmed concerning him who, while disobeying the commandments of God, still makes his boast of the knowledge of God, that the *truth* is not in him, and concerning him who loving his brother, abides in the light that *offence* is not in him (vv. iv. 10), it is evident that the ἀλήθεια and the σκάνδαλον cannot be made to agree, and that the former is also an immoral thing.

2. Since John makes τὰς ἐντολὰς and τὸν λόγον τηρεῖν perfectly parallel, and regards the Law with its particular commandments, and the revelation of God in His word as a unit, and contemplates the love of God as growing and maturing toward perfection by the obedient observance of the same, the presumption is that *the same loving Will of God* has revealed itself both in *the Law* and *in the Gospel*, and that man's love of God lives on, ought and has to live on the wholesome food of both. But this decidedly excludes any and every *meritoriousness of obedience* and of good works; just as in the Gospel faith in the love of God does not constitute a merit, so in the Law obedience to the loving Will of God is not a merit. Obedience is simply a sign and mark of the Christian life begun on the foundation and in the efficiency of the reconciliation accomplished by Christ. Our only merit before God is Christ, and beside Him no man can have any merit before God.

3. John does not in any way countenance the doctrine of the Council of Trent (Sess. VI., chap. 16) that "the justified are able fully to satisfy (*plene satisfacere*) the divine law by means of works wrought in God" [*Nihil ipsis justificatis amplius deesse credendum est, quo minus plene illis quidem operibus quæ in Deo sunt facta, divinæ legi pro hujus vitæ statu satisfecisse.*—M.], because he does not speak of that which *has an historical existence*, but of that which is to *become a reality;* he refers not to *actual* reality, but to *ideal* reality. On this account the words of John rather sustain Luther's paradox: "The righteous sins in every good work *mortaliter*, at least *venialiter*"—or Schleiermacher's translation of it: "even in our good works there is something in consequence of which we stand in need of forgiveness for them." Though [Roman] Catholicism debase the Law and blunt its requirements in order to exalt man, we are bound to exalt the Law, though man be debased and humbled, since the case as put by John is and remains only ideal truth, Christ alone being the exception, whom alone all are bound to follow.

4. The *unity* and *difference* of the characteristics of the *Old* and *New Testaments* appears in one point, namely, the commandment of brotherly love. This commandment is valid in either sphere; it derives in both spheres its origin from God; it has the same meaning in both, and is one in both, the old [commandment] which remains. But in virtue of Christ's example in His love of the brethren, it is more lucid, attractive, powerful, comprehensive and pure in the New than in the Old. It is new only in that which the Person of Christ has added thereto in His personal love; He is the new, which has been superadded to the old commandment.

5. The Perfect τετελείωται, v. 5, evidently denotes no historical truth, since the historical is marked by ἡ σκοτία παράγεται, τὸ φῶς ἤδη φαίνει. But these Presents indicate the assurance of victory and the joyfulness of hope with which that Perfect is anticipated. It signifies: "the whole power and sphere of the ethical life, separate from communion with God, (the Light in whom there is no darkness), still fighting against the Light, but evermore condemned, constantly overcome and consuming itself" (Düsterdieck), both in respect of the great totality of the world, and in respect of individual persons.

6. The progress in evil to perdition, and in good to the salvation of eternal life, is inward. The hidden life of the children of God has been commenced by the Forerunner; walking after Him, it grows in them, daily increasing in completeness, so that salvation, pursuant to divine appointment, is the consequence of a holy life on earth. But disobedience and unlovingness exert a reaction on the unloving, which forms their inward being and operates their perdition, which, in its turn, is also the result of their conduct here on earth.

7. As Christ is the principle of ethical life (v. 6), and love the principle in Him, as in the λόγος and the Law, so the love of Him, of God and of the brethren, must be the principle of obedience and of ethical life. Ultimately every thing concurs in brotherly love, which is the mark, while the love of God is the principle, the love of the loving God the fountain of all inward, Christian and godly life.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Examine thyself.

1. *What* is to be investigated? Whether you know God; and the *knowledge* of God is not without *fellowship* with God. The question is not knowledge concerning and about God, not having heard and learned certain truths relating to Him, but the *being* and *abiding in Him* (vv. 3, 5, 6). You are intimate only with those between whom and yourself there is habitual intercourse. Otherwise you have only a more distant and superficial acquaintance, but never an intimate knowledge.

2. *Why* it should be investigated? Without God you are in darkness, without Him you walk in darkness, you become more and more darkness yourself, you run to ruin, and perish at last in the darkness of condemnation; you reach the point that you hate, and are hated, hateful and abominable (vv. 9, 11). But with and in God you are in the light, you walk in the light, and light and truth and love are in you, you become more and more light, love in truth grows more perfect, and all offence will be put away from you (vv. 4, 5, 11).

3. *How* it should be investigated? Look after your *obedience* to the commandments of God (vv. 3, 4), more especially after the old and yet new commandment of the love of the brethren (vv. 7-11), and see whether you *walk after the Lord Jesus* (v. 6). He that keeps the commandments of God in thought, in word and in deed, keeps

himself; he that observes the commandments of God, preserves himself.

AUGUSTINE:—Christ says not, learn of me to create the world, to work miracles, to raise the dead, but that I am meek and lowly in heart.

LUTHER:—The commandment of love is a short commandment and a long commandment, one commandment and many commandments, it is no commandment and all the commandments. Short and one it is of itself, and soon mastered as to its meaning; but long and manifold in point of practice, for it is the sum and chief of all commandments. And it is no commandment at all in respect of the works, for it has no special work of its own by name; but it is all the commandments, because the works of all the commandments are and should be its works. The commandment of love therefore abrogates all the commandments and yet establishes all the commandments; and all this in order that we may know and learn thus much: *no commandment and no work is to be kept and binding, but in as far as it is the demand of love.*

SPENER:—There is a vast difference between living and dead knowledge; the one flows from the revelation of Jesus Christ (Jno. xiv. 21), from the Holy Ghost, and is therefore the operation of God; the other flows from reason, and consists in man's imagination; the latter knows only what people are wont to say of God, the former ascertains the mind of God; the one is a knowledge like that which I have of a man, concerning whom I have heard something, the other like that of one with whom I have had converse; the one is a feeble light, letting in only a beam into the understanding, the other is a heavenly light which fills and irradiates the whole soul, and in which we should walk.—It is a great consolation that God gives us a sure test, whereby we may be assured of our faith and consequently of our participation in the reconciliation of Christ, a test moreover which we may use also in a state of temptation, when the sense of faith is wanting.—Saying that we know God, amounts to nothing. Simon the sorcerer gave out that himself was some great one, but was not (Acts viii. 9); some say that they are Jews, and are not (Rev. iii. 9); but confession demands first of all a believing heart.—The imitation of Christ is not something that is left to our option, or only incumbent upon certain people desirous of attaining unto a peculiar perfection, but it is the universal obligation of all those who are in Christ Jesus, and is therefore binding on the high and on the low, on the clergy and on the laity, on men and women, in every manner and walk of life.—Teachers should treat their hearers as brethren, and use the paternal power within such limits, as never to forget their brotherly equality (Philem. x. 16). No condition of life gives to a man the liberty to hate his brother; but in whatsoever condition a man may be, he is never and in no wise permitted to hate his neighbour; and although he have occasionally to hurt him, as e. g., the authority of the land, which has to punish the wicked, yet must such condign punishment flow from love, as in the case of others so in his case, and be administered with a compassion that would, if it were able, rather withhold the severe remedy, just as a physician, moved by love, yet because of urgent necessity, will amputate the arm or leg of a patient.—There is no lack of offences in the world; let every one take care not to give offence, nor condemn others, but judge every thing in love. He that hateth his brother knows not the injury he inflicts upon himself, and into what misery he precipitates himself; for whereas he thinks that he loves himself and for his own interest, honour or pleasure, hates his neighbour, even as selfishness is the cause of all hatred, he hates himself most of all, when he fancies that he is loving himself (John xiii. 9).

LANGE:—The true followers of Christ have not a transient faith, but they are firm and steadfast like a branch in the vine, a bough in the tree, a house on its foundation. The duties of *common love* towards *every man* are these: 1. Intercession for the promotion of his conversion; 2. friendly admonition and correction at convenient seasons; 3. the careful avoidance of whatever may deter him from the practice of good; 4. the diligent warding-off of his loss under all circumstances; 5. kindly demeanour in words, manner and works. The duties of *particular love* towards *believers* are partly the same, partly those which are necessary to the maintenance of intimate brotherly converse and spiritual affinity.

STARKE:—A piece of coin stands the test; lead betrays itself that it is not silver, and brass that it is not gold. Perhaps by sound? No, by the streak; and this is to keep the commandments of Christ. Have a care, my soul. The loss of the fraud is thine own.—Faith worketh by love (Gal. v. 6); wherefore the faith, whence no good works do proceed, is only dead faith (Jas. ii. 17, 26).—The perfection of believers' love of God consists in that it is honest, sincere, pure, undivided, upright, faithful and without hypocrisy, lacking neither a truly divine impulse nor holy ardour, neither true reverence of God, nor ardent zeal for and towards God, although as yet unable to take and hallow all the thoughts of the mind, or to present all its powers as an offering of love to God.—As we know that a branch which bears good fruit is truly in the vine (for were it otherwise how could it bear fruit?) so we may surely say of a man that does truly good works, that he is truly planted in Christ.—Come hither, ye that refuse to believe that it is necessary to be pious. Christ is your Forerunner! Do as He did! Look upon His example. Arbitrary choice and presumptuous conceit pave the road to hell.—It is a great comfort that our Christian doctrine is sure and established, not liable to change and to be presented now in one way, now in another, but remains always the same, because God, who has wisdom and truth, is its Author, and needs not at any time to change that which He has given us once for all. Examine thyself, O man! who art thou? The child of God, or of the devil? Consider only whether thou lovest or hatest thy neighbour? If thou lovest him in deed and in truth, thou art in the light and in God's; but if thou hatest Him and showest thy hatred either outwardly in works, or concealest it inwardly in thy heart, and withdrawest thyself from Him, then thou hast a sign that thou art in darkness and the devil's. Tremble at thyself, and amend thy ways!

HEUBNER:—To know Christ is to know, experience and delight in Him as our Friend and Saviour, and to enjoy His grace and fellowship. The mark of it is the keeping of His commandments, vital, active Christianity. Works are not the ground of justification, but a mark to ourselves, whether justifying faith is in us, and whether we *are* justified; because Christ when He gives Himself to us, never gives Himself half but entire; to whom He becomes justification, to them He also becomes sanctification. We may therefore conclude backwards, to whom He has not yet become sanctification, to them also He has not yet become justification.—The assertion of justifying faith and want of holiness, fidelity and conscientiousness, constitutes a contradiction and makes the assertor a liar.—In those who keep the words of Christ, we may plainly see that they have really tasted the forgiving love of God, that it has carried captive their hearts and filled them with love to God.—Hatred, selfishness, is a state of darkness because the lightsome knowledge of God, of the love of Christ is still wanting, because it has not yet penetrated and illuminated the heart, because therefore the soul also is still in a dark, rent state, at discord with itself, without seeing the gracious countenance of God which renders us light, and, as it were, resplendent of countenance.—He knows not 1, how far this evil, unloving mind may carry him, and 2, what will be his end, what his reward,—exclusion from the kingdom of light.

NEANDER:—Believing aright in John's sense, is a matter of life.—His commandments are only separate traits in which His life-forming word develops itself.—As genuine love can evidence itself only in the observance of Christ's word, so there are different degrees of the manner how this love has more or less interpenetrated the life of men.—He Himself is in His commandments, and they also are only separate parts of His self-revelation.—The life of every believer should be only a peculiar representation of the image of Christ, the original of the new and glorified humanity.—Either love or hatred of the brethren; love which is ready for any sacrifice, or selfishness that may also pass into hatred; even as Christ indicates only the two fundamental biasses: to serve God or the world.

BESSER:—Would I know whether I know God, I must not examine my knowledge but my walk; and would I know whether thou knowest God, I do not ask that which thy mouth may have to say of Him, but that which thy life does testify of Him.—Just in the sense of John we read in the Epistle to Diognetus: There is neither life without knowledge, nor right knowledge without the true life.—It is characteristic of love that it would do nothing to grieve but every thing to please the Beloved, surrendering its will and weal, its honour and life to the Beloved; His pleasure is its pleasure; what displeases Him, it hates.—The motto of St. Francis was: "*Tantum quisque scit, quantum operatur.*"—Cursed be all science that cannot stand the test of the commandments of Jesus Christ!—This indisputable *ought* (*v.* 6), is at the same time a blessed *may* to John and to all who have John's mind [That is, the *duty* is to them a blessed *privilege*, which they receive with grateful hearts.—M.].—When the pagans looked with amazement on the love of the early Christians, and exclaimed: "See how these Christians love one another, and are ready to die for one another," when the mark of Christians was described in the words: "They love each other even before they know each other," then there shone the resplendent light before which darkness recedes. Would that this day, when it comprises *already* a much longer period of light, there could be found no Christian Church, in whose new walk that is not truth and reality which John writes to the Christians as an old commandment.

[SECKER:—*If we keep His commandments*, v. 3. Whosoever doth so, though imperfectly, yet sincerely and humbly, hath nothing to fear. Whosoever doth not, hath nothing to hope. Strong feelings of joyful assurance may be given to the pious from above as a present reward; and strong feelings of vain presumption may lead on the wicked, secure and triumphant, to their final destruction. Very reasonable terrors from consciousness of their guilt, may torment the bad beforehand; and very unreasonable ones, from constitution or the suggestions of Satan, may assault the good. Therefore we are to judge of our condition by none of these things; but by the Scripture rule, fairly interpreted: "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous; he that committeth sin is of the devil" 1 Jno. iii. 7, 8.—M.].

[BARROW:—(v. 5). If a man perform any good work not out of the love to God, but from any other principle or any other design (to please himself or others, to get honour or gain thereby) how can it be acceptable to God, to whom it hath not any due regard? And what action hath it for its principle, or its ingredient, becomes sanctified thereby, in great measure pleasing and acceptable to God; such is the work and value thereof. It is also the great commandment for efficacy and influence, being naturally productive of obedience to all other commandments; especially of the most genuine and sincere obedience; no other principle being in force and activity comparable thereto; fear may drive to a compliance with some, and hope may draw to an observance of others; but it is love, that with a kind of willing constraint and kindly violence carries on cheerfully, vigorously and swiftly, to the performance of all God's commandments.

(v. 6): "To *abide in Christ*, to *be in Christ*, to *put on Christ* and reciprocally Christ's *being in us*, *living*, *dwelling*, *being formed in us*, and the like expressions, occurring in Holy Scripture, do not denote any physical inherence, or essential conjunction between Christ and us, such as those who affect unintelligible mysteries, rather than plain sense, would conceit; but only that mutual relation accruing from our profession of being Christ's disciples, our being inserted into His body, the Church, being governed by His laws, partaking of His grace, with all the privileges of the Gospel, relying upon His promises, and hoping for eternal salvation from Him. By virtue of which relation we may be said, in a mystical or moral manner, to be united to Him, deriving strength and sustenance from Him, as the members from the head, the branches from the tree, the other parts of the building from the foundation, by which similitudes this mysterious union is usually expressed in Scripture; in

effect, briefly, *to be in Christ*, or *to abide in Christ* implieth no more, but our being truly in faith and practice Christians; so that the meaning of St. John's words seemeth plainly and simply to be this. Whosoever pretends to be a Christian, that is, to believe the doctrine and embrace the discipline of Christ, *ought to walk*, that is, is obliged to order the whole course of his life and actions, *as Christ walked*, that is, as Christ lived and conversed in the world; or, it is the duty of every one professing Christianity to conform his life to the pattern of Christ's life, to follow His example, to imitate His practice.—M.].

[HORNE:—(v. 6). No one can fail to see that the life of Christ was designed as a pattern for His followers, who considers how admirably it is calculated for that purpose. We meet not here with legendary tales of romantic austerities, ecstasies and abstractions, tending only to amaze and embarrass the consciences of men with unprofitable and unnecessary scruples, but we behold a life, which though holy and without spot or blemish from beginning to end, was conducted after the manner of men, and so as to be imitable by them; being passed into the midst of civil society, and in the exercise of all those lovely graces, by which that is preserved and improved, sweetened and sanctified. And we should find it the best compendium of morality, the most perfect and unerring rule whereby to direct ourselves in all cases, if we would only ask our own hearts, before we enter upon an action, how the blessed Jesus would behave in our circumstances. A conscience, but moderately informed from the Gospel, would seldom perhaps give a wrong determination.—M.].

[BURKITT:—(v. 7). The commandment of love might be called an *old commandment*, as being a branch of the law of nature, and a known precept of the Jewish religion: although in other respects it might be called *a new commandment*, because urged from a new motive, and enforced by a new example.—M.].

[CLARKE:—There is a saying in *Synopsis, Sohar*, p. 94, n. 51, that may cast some light on this passage: "That way in which the just have walked, although it be *old*, yet may be said to be *new* in the love of the righteous."

(v. 11). Love prevents him from giving any offence to his neigbour, and love prevents him from receiving any from his neighbor, because it leads him to put the best construction on every thing. Besides, as he walks in the light, he sees the stumbling-blocks that are in the way, and avoids them; every part of his path being illuminated. Many fall into sin because they do not see the snares that are in their way; and they do not see the snares because they either have not received, or do not abide in the light.—M.].

[PYLE:—Wherefore it is an effect of the most malicious prejudice and stupid ignorance of plain truth, for any man to profess himself a true disciple of Christ, while he harbours revengeful thoughts and uncharitable principles towards other men. On the contrary, a kind behaviour and tender disposition towards all our brethren is one of the best instances of Christian perfection, and secures us from all the scandal and mischievous effects of a censorious and persecuting temper.—M.].

[NEANDER:—(v. 8). Thus, too, John contemplates Christ as Himself the true light, holding the same relation to the spiritual as the sun to the natural life. What he here says then is this: With those who have been so long attached to Christianity, the darkness proceeding from their former heathen state is passing away, and the true light is now breaking. *Now*, he says,—meaning their present in contrast with their former state of heathenism, or while still affected by its remaining influence. The light derived from Christ, the true Light, was already banishing the former darkness—they were becoming constantly more and more enlightened. So Paul says to his readers, Rom. xiii. 11 sqq., that now their salvation is nearer than when they believed, that the end of the night approaches, the day of the Lord draws near. It is, therefore, *true*, both with reference to Christ, the true Light which has dawned upon their souls, and with reference to believers who have received this light and been illuminated thereby, that this fundamental law of Christianity now verifies its character as the new command. To those who live in the light of Christ, who have become at home in the new world of Christianity, the old commandment now, in contrast with the former state of darkness, presents itself in new glory as the new command. In new power must it be revealed to their hearts, that BROTHERLY LOVE constitutes the essence of the Christian life, is the essential mark of fellowship with Christ.—M.].

[WORDSWORTH:—Christian *Praxis* is the test of Christian *Gnosis*.—True Christians are the genuine *Gnostics*.—The Gnostics pretended to have *light*, to have special *illumination;* but their light is a false light, it is the light of wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness" (on v. 8).—M.].

Sermons:

[VER. 4. SMALRIDGE, BP.: Disobedience to the commandments of God, a mark of unbelief. Sermons, 199.

VER. 5. DWIGHT, T.: His example. Theology, II. 359.

VER. 6. FLAVEL, JOHN: Imitation of Christ in holiness. 2 Serm. Works II. 299.

BARROW, IS.: Abiding in Christ to be demonstrated by walking in Christ. Serm. Works II. 362.

VER. 8. ALFORD, H.: The shining light. Hulsean Lecture, 1842. 1.—M.].

---

6. *Consolatory warning against the love of the world.*

CHAPTER 2, 12—17.

12 I write unto you, little children, because your sins are[1] forgiven you for his name's
13 sake. I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him *that is* from the begin-

ning. I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one.[2] I
14 write[3] unto you, little children, because ye have known the Father. I have written
unto you, fathers, because ye have known him[4] *that is* from the beginning. I have
written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in
15 you, and ye have overcome the wicked one. Love not the world, neither the things
that are in the world.[5] If any man love the world, the love of the Father[6] is not in
16 him. For[7] all that *is* in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and
17 the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth
away, and the lust thereof:[8] but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever.

Verse 12. [[1] ἀφέωνται, Perf. Pass. formed after the Perfect Active ἀφέωκα, here and Matth. ix. 2. 5; Mark ii. 5; Luke v. 20, 23; vii. 47; Syriac—*remissa sunt*, "HAVE BEEN FORGIVEN YOU" more correct than E. V. "are forgiven you."—M.]
[[2] Cod. Sin. reads τὸ πονηρόν.—M.]
Verse 13. [3] ἔγραψα, A. B. C., Cod. Sin. The reading γράφω is without critical authority, and opposed to the ructure of this series of sentences.
Verse 14. [4] τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in B., which might allude to ch. i. 1, is evidently a slip of the pen, since the same Codex reads τὸν in v. 13.
Verse 15. [[5] μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ—*nor the things in the world*, more correct than "the things that are in the world" E. V.—M.]
[6] τοῦ πατρὸς, B. [G. K.] Cod. Sin.; the best verss. Fathers [Oec. Theophyl.—M.]. The reading Θεοῦ A. C. must yield the place to the former authorities, and to the context v. 16.
Verse 16. [[7] ὅτι—because, so German.—M.]
Verse 17. [[8] αὐτοῦ after ἐπιθυμία, although wanting in A. and cancelled by Griesbach, is the true reading. The difficulty readily accounts for the omission.—M].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The structure of vv. 12–14.—The six members are evidently divided into two triads: the thrice repeated Present γράφω, and the thrice-repeated Aorist ἔγραψα, as well as the address τεκνία, πατέρες, νεανίσκοι joined to the Present, and παιδία, πατέρες, νεανίσκοι joined to the Aorist, clearly intimate as much. The sentences subjoined by ὅτι exhibit the same correspondency, and confirm this arrangement. This has to be proved by the exegesis.

The addresses, vv. 12–14. Τεκνία must be taken here in the same sense as in the other passages of the Epistle where it occurs, ch. ii. 1, 28; iii. 18; iv. 4; v. 21. It applies to all readers, the whole Church, and should not be made to designate a particular age (as has been done by Erasmus, Socinus, J. Lange), or a peculiarly near relation to the author. The diminutive form is chosen for the sake of intimacy and cordiality, and is indicative of the paternal relation and advanced age of the Apostle. The addition μου, ch. ii. 1, may have a still more intimate sound, but there is no want of intimacy here or in ch. iii. 18; iv. 4; v. 21, although μου is wanting. It is altogether parallel to ἀγαπητοί, ch. ii. 7; iii. 2, 21; iv. 1, 7, 11, or to παιδία, ch. ii. 18; iii. 7, (*var lect.*). Although παιδία is thus rarely used, nevertheless it is used, and, if we take it here= τεκνία, it is used thrice. Hence there is no reason whatsoever why παιδία, v. 18, should not be applied to the whole Church, but, like πατέρες and νεανίσκοι, be understood to designate a particular age (with Calvin, Luther, Calov, Sander, Neander, Besser, Ebrard, al.), and to disturb the harmony of the structure of this group of sentences. Particularly as the comprehensive παιδία, little children, offered a more natural sequence to πατέρες and νεανίσκοι than τεκνία, little *sons*. The order in which τεκνία and παιδία occur, forbids their being referred to a particular age, for either νεανίσκοι, πατέρες would have to follow, or πατέρες, νεανίσκοι to go before. Hence τεκνία and παιδία must be construed as denoting the general address, and πατέρες and νεανίσκοι the specialization of church-members, πατέρες describing those of maturer years (πρεσβύτεροι, γέροντες, heads of families, the more experienced), and νεανίσκοι those younger in years. This is the view of most commentators. Augustine's view, according to which the Apostle refers throughout to the *same* persons, only designating them by different names from different points of view, is consequently untenable: he says: "filioli, *quia baptismo neonati sunt*, patres, *quia Christum, patrem et antiquum dierum agnoscunt*, adolescentes, *qui, fortes sunt et validi;*" nor must we refer, with a Lapide, the different addresses to a "*triplicem Christianorum in virtute gradum; pueri enim repræsentanti incipientes et neophytos; juvenes proficientes, senes perfectos.*" Similar explanations are given by Clement, Oecumen., Grotius (with reference to 1 Cor. xiii. 11, 12; Heb. v. 13; Eph. iv. 13, 14) and others.

The *tenses* of the otherwise clear verb, γράφω and ἔγραψα, vv. 12–14, present great difficulties. It is clear that ὅτι does not denote the *substance* of his present or former writing. John writes not *that* their sins are forgiven, and *that* they have known the Father, *that* they have known Him that is from the beginning, *that* they have overcome the wicked one, *that* they are strong, *that* the word of God abideth in them, all this he does not write, and has not written to his church, but other things. Hence ὅτι can only be taken as a *causative* particle; it denotes *the reason* and *cause* of his writing, and must be rendered "*because.*" It is self-evident that ὅτι, if translated "*because*" once, must be translated thus throughout, in all the six consecutive places where it occurs, and not be rendered with Luther the first, fifth and sixth time "*that,*" and the second, third and fourth time "*for*" (=*because*).—Socinus, Schott, Sander, Neander translate "*that;*" Calvin, Beza, Lücke, de Wette, Huther, Düsterdieck, al. "*because;*" while Erdmann gives to ὅτι a declarative meaning in the first three sentences, without determining whether it should be construed objectively and causatively in the last three sentences. *I write*—simply defines the act of writing: *I write just now* what I write, *because*—. The object is the *Epistle*, even this Epistle. Now, if John, after this thrice-repeated γράφω signifying this Epistle, says again three

times ἔγραψα, the reference cannot be to the Epistle, neither to the preceding exhortations (Grotius), nor to the first chapter (Calov), neither in respect of the thrice-repeated ἔγραψα to ch. i. 5-7; i. 8-ii. 2, 3-11 and γράφω to ch. ii. 15-17; 18-27; ii. 28—iii. 22 (Riokli and Lücke), nor so that the reference is general, the *Aorist* denoting that part of the Epistle which is already written, the *Present* the part as yet unwritten, but in process of development [the very act of writing, *i. e.*, the Epistle itself.—M.] (so de Wette, Brückner, Huther) nor can the reference be to vv. 12, 13, as if the apostle had said "I write, and I have written, it is a settled thing" (J. Lange, Neander, Sander, Ewald, Heubner, Bengel ["*innuit commonitionem firmissimam*"]), nor are Beza and Düsterdieck any more satisfactory, who suppose the *Present* to indicate the present stand-point of the Apostle, his present act of writing, and the *Aorist* to describe the stand-point of the readers after they had received the Epistle, when, of course, it was written;—all these explanations are so many attempts whose very forced and artificial character shows them to be mere make-shifts, which, even in their more simple forms, do not remove the appearance of *trifling*, and explain as little the position of the *Present* relating to what follows before the *Aorist* relating to what goes before, as that the author by this change of tense tears asunder that which he has written from that which he is about to write, both of which belong together as one. If we are thus constrained to think of another writing, we must not think of a previous Epistle (Michaelis), but of the *Gospel* (Socinus, Lange, Schott, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ebrard, Hoffmann), to which this Epistle is not only nearly related in the exordium, but also in its very kernel and essence. Cf. *Introduction*, § 8, 3. The consciousness of the importance of the Gospel he had written, fully justifies in the Epistle the threefold repetition of ἔγραψα in consideration of the reasons relating to different groups of persons in the Church, and warranting such repetition; nor can it be thought singular that he had no other reasons (ὅτι) for having written the Gospel than those for writing the Epistle. Nor may an objection be raised to the Apostle's not specifying the object either of ἔγραψα or γράφω, and his not describing the writing to which he refers, because both the Gospel and the Epistle were in the hands of the readers, and enabled them both to find the necessary explanation, and to prevent possible misunderstanding. [The peculiarly involved statement of Braune renders it desirable to supply the English reader with a more lucid account of the views he advocates. Γράφω, denotes the present act of writing, not only the particular sentence in which that word occurs, but the present Epistle; ἔγραψα, a writing already written, finished and complete in the hands of the readers of the Epistle, to which they might refer; and that writing was the Gospel, which would clear up every doubt, remove every difficulty, and furnish a commentary on the statements and exhortations contained in the Epistle. It must be confessed that this is, on the whole, the most simple and satisfactory solution of a very knotty question, although that advocated by de Wette, Brückner and Huther is not so *trifling* as Braune, echoing the words of Ebrard, asserts. Said authors explain ἔγραψα of that part of the Epistle which the Apostle had already written, and γράφω of the immediate act of writing, that is, to the Epistle in general; in their view it is proper that John should begin with γράφω while his reference to the part already written by ἔγραψα may be explained by the fact that that part (especially ch. i. 5—ii, 11) contains the fundamental principles of the subsequent exhortations and developments. Personally we prefer the view of Braune, but many readers will, doubtless, incline to that set forth by Huther and others.—Ebrard gives the following synopsis of the two triads:

TRIAD THE FIRST.	TRIAD THE SECOND.
γράφω.	ἔγραψα.
1. τεκνία=all readers.	1. Children (in point of age).
2. Fathers.	2. Fathers.
3. Young men.	3. Young men.

and Wordsworth (who, however, does not discuss the details of his arrangement, and carries the series down to v. 28) makes a series of *seven*, closed by an *eighth*, the octave of the first, with a *symbolical* reference to the number *seven* and *eight*. His arrangement is this:

γράφω ὑμῖν, τεκνία, v. 12.

γράφω ὑμῖν, πατέρες, v. 13.	ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, πατέρες, v. 14.
γράφω ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι, v. 13.	ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι, v. 15.
ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, παιδία, v. 13.	παιδία, ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστί, v. 18.

καὶ νῦν, τεκνία, μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ, v. 28.

This arrangement is more curious than valuable or logical, and merely added to complete the catalogue of representative views begun above. M.].

The *reasons* of the Apostle's writing vv. 12-14.

First series, vv. 12, 13*b*.

VER. 12. **I write unto you, little children, because your sins have been forgiven you.**—The Perfect ἀφέωνται (See Winer, Grammar, § 14, 3, p. 93, on the form of this word) points to the forgiveness of sins, mentioned ch. i. 8, sqq.; ii. 1, 2, as a completed fact, which, as a ground whereon they stand, as a sphere wherein they move, as a benefit they have received, has and is to have on them and the rest of their life a lasting effect and an efficient power. [The forgiveness of sins is the *ground* of the Christian life.—M.]. Vulg., Augustine and Calvin render falsely "*remittuntur*," so Luther, "are forgiven you," [and E. V.—M.] **For His name's sake.** The reference is not to Him who forgives sins, God the Father, but to Him, for whose sake the Father forgives; that is

Christ; for διὰ with the *Accusative* is not *per*, through (*instrumental*), but *propter*, on account of, for the sake of, indicating the *ground* of the forgiveness of sins, and here, where the cordiality of the address (*little children*), and the direct application to the persons addressed (I write unto *you*, *your* sins have been forgiven *you*), are to be brought out, it denotes the objective ground, rendered *subjective:* since His name is with you, in you and among you; His name is He Himself and what He is, but revealed and known, believed and confessed; hence=since ye have believed on Him, confess and invoke Him, individually and collectively, and since He has manifested Himself and may yet further manifest Himself as ἱλασμὸς, παράκλητος; consequently *for Christ's sake in you.* Thus we might combine with Neander the explanation of Düsterdieck, who insists with the majority of commentators on the objective ground of the forgiveness of sins, and that of Luther, who understands the subjective ground. [Neander says: "He comforts them with the assurance of sins forgiven through the mediation of Christ. For the name of Christ are their sins forgiven; that is, for the sake of what Christ is as the Son of God and the Son of Man, the divine-human Redeemer—it being as such that they invoke Him as their Mediator."—M.].

Ver. 13*a*. **I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning.**—Ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, according to ch. i. 1 and the context, can only signify Christ, with reference to His eternal, Divine Nature; for the ἀρχή reaches beyond the beginning of time and of the world, into God's eternal life, and must not be weakened into "*initium novi fœderis et evangelii patefacti*" (Socinus). Grotius and a Lapide, without all contextual sanction, explain "*novistis Deum, qui Senex dierum,*" Dan. vii. 9; xiii. 22. Ἐγνώκατε consequently denotes only the more profound understanding of the nature and eternal glory of Christ, spiritual knowledge, and not personal acquaintance, not even on the part of *some* (Bengel: "*vivebant patres eo tempore, quo Christus in terris fuerat conspiciendus, et eorum nonnulli eum et facie et fide, omnes fide cognorant*") so the ἐγνώκατε τὸν πατέρα, v. 13*c* must on no account be explained of personal acquaintance. Nor does this exhortation warrant the idea that the Fathers, the aged, love to hear and talk of old things, and that to them, in particular, knowledge ought to belong. (The Greek Fathers, Augustine, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Neander). But more profound knowledge in general, and knowledge of Jesus Christ, His Person and work in particular, is peculiarly suited to the calmness and experience of old age.

Ver. 13*b*. **I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one.**—While young men are exposed to the power of temptation in respect of the world, both within and without, they have also fresh vigor and courage to fight against and overcome the wicked one, τὸν πονηρόν, the devil, who is thus designated in the N. T. in general (Matth. xiii. 19, cf. xxviii, 38, sq.; Eph. vi. 16); and in this Epistle in particular (ch. iii. 12; v. 18 sq.) Carpzov: "*Viris fortibus et robustis tribuitur supra fortissimum et robustissimum victoria.*" But we must not narrow the idea with Bengel, who says: "*Insigne quoddam specimen virtutis a juvenibus, quibus scribit, exhibitum, cujusmodi erat constantia confessionis in persecutione Domitiani, itemque reditus juvenis illius, quem apostolus summa mansuetudine a lactrocinio ad pœnitentiam reduxit, suavissime descriptus a* Clemente Al. *lib. quis dives salv. c.* 42, *ab.* Eusebio H. E., *lib.* 3, *cap.* 20 *et a* Chrysostomo, *Paræn.* 1 *ad Theodorum lapsum, cap.* 11. We may think of it, but take it in the widest reach. That which John says to all, the τεκνίοις, that their sins have been forgiven, applies indeed to all, and it does not apply exclusively to the fathers, that they have known the Lord, or exclusively to the young men, that they have overcome the wicked one; for it may be that there are fathers who have just gained the victory, and young men who have acquired profound knowledge; but besides the general truth of the forgiveness of sins, those particular affirmations are admirably distributed among the different classes, and only possible and real on the condition of that general declaration. "Christian life-truth is essentially one; in whichever direction its riches may be developed, or to whichever relations it may be applied, all these different exhortations and instructions are always of *one* casting, resting on one foundation, and animated by one spirit" Düsterdieck). But John has a particular word, a word of peculiar application for the whole Church, as well as for the separate groups and individuals.

Second series, v. 13*c*—v. 14.

Ver. 13*c*.—**I have written unto you, little sons, because ye have known the Father.** To know the Father, that is, to know God as our Father, to cast deeper looks into the peace-thoughts of His heart concerning us, into the holy Love which is His Being, is possible only in the more intimate converse with Him which He opens in the forgiveness of our sins and our reconciliation. The child, with its child-like ways and mind, with its humility, attachment, diligence, teachableness and receptivity, is nearer to God than an adult. Here also apply the words, "*Become as little children*" Matth. xviii. 3. It is easy to see that we have here the parallel of the clause, "Because your sins have been forgiven you;" adoption and forgiveness of sins interpenetrate each other, and more than mere correlates. He now writes to the fathers precisely the same thing as before:

Ver. 14. **I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known Him that is from the beginning.**—His object is not to write something else; for he has rightly divided the word.

I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one.—"*Alii juvenes corpore, vos fide.*" (Bengel). Matth. xii. 29; Luke xi. 21, sq.; Heb. xi. 34. It is the strength of the Spirit for the combat and victory, the strength of their own spirit, and derived from the Spirit of God, given from above, through and with the adoption and the forgiveness of sins. The ἀγγελία (ch. i. 5). with the ἀλήθεια ch. i. 6. 8; ii. 4), in the word of God, (ch. i. 10; ii. 2. 5. 7), creates and moves this vital strength and vital courage

for the combat. Hence ἰσχυροί ἐστε is immediately followed by καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένει. Ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, therefore, does not denote Christ, although He is the centre and star of that word. The word of God, with its eternal power, must not only be brought to them, but it must have entered into them and remain in them; then it happens: καὶ νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν. The strength is grounded on the word of God, which abides in them (μένει), and in virtue of this strength they have overcome the devil [the thought belongs to Huther—M.]; the decisive battle, of course, has been fought by Jesus Christ, but His people ought to follow up His victory by continuous warfare, and gain further triumphs in their heart and sphere of life, cf. Jno. xvi. 33. A retrospective view of the preceding verses, assigning the reasons for the Apostle's writing and having written, characterizes the readers as possessing not a small degree of Christian knowledge and ability, and the writings in question as taking for granted such a degree of Christian culture. While we may therefore think of the Epistle and the Gospel, we cannot say with Ebrard that the Gospel is wholesome and pleasant food for the *little ones* (παιδία), but that the Epistle can be understood by adults only. Now has been laid down an important and sure foundation for the subsequent warnings and exhortations (Luther, S. Schmid, Episcopius, Bengel, Lücke, de Wette, Düsterdieck, al.): You have received and acquired so much, and succeeded so well, that you ought to progress, and not to retrograde! You stand in life-fellowship with God—do not dissolve it!

The warning. Ver. 15*a*. **Love not the world, neither the things in the world.** The correct exposition of the whole depends on the meaning of ὁ κόσμος, which signifies according to Suidas: εὐπρέπειαν, τὸ πᾶν, τάξιν, τὸ πλῆθος, or according to Hesychius: κάλλος and then the beautiful fabric of the material universe. "*Quem κόσμον Græci nomine ornamenti appellaverunt, eum nos a perfecta absolutaque elegantia mundum*" (Plinius. *H. N.* 2, 3). The LXX *do not apply the word κόσμος, strictly taken,* to the universe. In the New Testament we find it used in all these senses, 1 Pet. i. 3=εὐπρέπεια, τάξις; Acts xvii. 24; Jno. xxi. 25; xvii. 5; Matth. xxiv. 21; Rev. xii. 8; xvii. 8=τὸ πᾶν, and especially by John in the Gospel ch. i. 9; xi. 9; xii. 19; xviii. 36; 1 Jno. ii. 2; iv. 1. 3. 9. 14.=the creation of the earth, especially of the world of man (Düsterdieck)=τὸ πλῆθος. Now the difference between οὗτος ὁ κόσμος=τὰ κάτω and τὰ ἄνω (Jno. viii. 23), which is at the same time the opposite of both, makes κόσμος to denote the whole kingdom of sin and death, inimical to God, under Satan its prince, and more particularly the world of man as fallen away and estranged from God (Jno. xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11; 1 Jno. iv. 4; v. 19; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. vi. 11, sq.). But all this without the faintest trace of dualism. For the κόσμος, as originally created by God, was very good (cf. Gen. i. 31, with Jno. i. 3, 10), but became evil and is the object of redeeming love (Jno. iii. 16; 1 Jno. ii. 2; iv. 14), so that the children of the world become the children of God in their faith in Christ and His Word (Jno. i. 12; xii. 45–50); there is no man who is not first born flesh of the flesh, and yet born spirit of the spirit may not and should not become the child of God (Jno. iii. 6; 1 Jno. iii. 9, 14).—Now the sum-total of this earthly kingdom of evil is alternately applied in a *real* sense to the earthly sphere in general, and in a *personal* sense to the world of man, sinful, and abiding in sin; and these two conceptions frequently and easily play the one into the other. The present passage must be interpreted by the *usus loquendi* current in the N. T., and we must "lay down the rule that κόσμος bears the same meaning in all the three verses, so intimately connected together" (Düsterdieck). We cannot say with a Lapide "*omnibus hisce modis*" (*i. e.* three different meanings: "1. *homines mundani, in his proprie est concupiscentia; 2. orbis sublunaris, in hoc mundo proprie et formaliter non est concupiscentia; sed in eo est concupiscentia materialis, i. e. objectum concupiscibile: 3. ipsa mundana vita vel concupiscentia in genere*): *omnibus hisce modis* mundus *hic accipi potest et Johannes nunc ad unum, nunc ad alterum respicit;* ludit *enim in voce mundus.*" Points of support necessary to the right explanation of our passage are these: κόσμος is the opposite of God, it is a whole consisting of various parts and members, it is easily the object of love: it has a life, but lacks permanence and endurance. Hence it is evidently the earthly sphere of life, especially as filled with the world of man and opposing God, whose *real* side often alternates or concurs with its *personal* side; as applied to things, we have to think not so much of trees, flowers, mountains and stars as of whatever forms part of and constitutes the world of man, such as rank or dignity, possessions and gifts of the mind and of the body and such like. Consequently the κόσμος must not be taken as the sum-total of transient creatures as far as they are natural things as Lücke (sum-total of all sensuous manifestations, exciting sensuous pleasure), with whom we must rank, de Wette, Brückner, or J. Lange (*systema totius mundi*), Neander (the world and worldly things), and others construe the word. But equally objectionable is the interpretation which makes κόσμος=the evil inhering in the world, as given by Greek authors (ἡ κοσμικὴ φιληδονία καὶ διάχυσις), Luther (=the world, *i. e.* ungodliness itself, human passions according to which man does not rightly use the creature), Calvin (*omne genus corruptionis et malorum omnium abyssum*), Morus (*malum morale*) Semler (*vulgata consuetudo hominum, res corporeas unice appetentium*), Erdmann (*totus complexus et ambitus mali*), Ebrard (τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ=kinds of sinful living, thinking and demeanor [*e. g.* covetousness, ambition, sensuality.—M.]). Lastly, we must not limit the application of κόσμος to "*the heathen world*" (Lange), "the mass of ordinary men" (Oecumenius: ὁ συρφετὸς not συνφυτός, as Braune corrects M.] ὄχλος, ὃς οὐ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχει ἀγάπην ἐν ἑαυτῷ; Calov.: *homines dediti rebus hujus mundi*), "the major part of men" (Grotius: *humanum genus, secundum* partem majorem, *quæ in malis actionibus versatur*), "to that part of the world which constituted the anti-christians" (Storr, Socinus). Cf. Düsterdieck and Huther *ad loc.* [the latter giving all the passages cited by Braune.—M.].—Now while John, according to the Lord, urges love, notwithstanding Jno. iii. 16: οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον he says here

μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον. There is a difference, if the Lord our Saviour and Redeemer, who is above the world, loves, or if we love that are of the world, needing salvation, although salvable. To love is to surrender oneself; God surrenders Himself in order to save, overcome and glorify; the creature can only surrender itself to the world to be ruined, swept along and carried off. The creature is forbidden to enter into intimate and vital communion, or entire life-fellowship with that sphere of humanity which has fallen away from God. The Saviour does it in order to save from it those who suffer themselves to be seized by Him.—Μηδὲ=*but not even*, or *no, not even*. The Apostle consequently draws a sharp distinction between τὸν κόσμον and τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, the whole or the general, and the particular or the specific. You are not even to love a particular, a specific part of the κόσμος; one may be fascinated by this thing, another by that, it all amounts to the same; the love of the world is there where we find the love of the particular or of one particular in the world, be it the gold of the earth, which is highly valued among men, or human wisdom, or honour with men, or power and dominion, or only influence of a less degree and in a limited sphere.—This warning is obviously addressed to all, the πατέρες and νεανίσκοι. "*Omnibus hæc generaliter ecclesiæ filiis scribit*" (Bede). It is not said to *the children* only (Oecumenius); for παιδία and τεκνία denote the whole church (see above); nor to the *young men* only (Bengel, Sander, Besser), although it follows the last address. The next verse, which is purely general, as well as the import of this warning, require us to understand it as being universal in its application.

The reasons. vv. 15*b*–17.

First reason. vv. 15*b*, 16. **If any one love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.**—"*Unum cor duos tam sibi adversarios amores non capit.*" (Bede) "*Contraria non sunt simul*" (Bengel). Since ὁ κόσμος is the object of love, since the Apostle is concerned with the love of the world and the heart of man which loves, ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς is of course our love of the Father; for the love of the Father is not incompatible with the love of the world (Jno. iii. 16). Hence ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς denotes neither "*amor Patris erga suos et filialis erga Patrem*" (Bengel), nor "the love of God toward us" (Luther II., Calov.), nor the "*caritas quam Pater præscribit*" (Socinus). We have here the same antithesis which is noted in Matth. vi. 24: ϑεῷ καὶ μαμωνᾷ δουλεύειν, Rom. viii. 5 (σάρξ and πνεῦμα), v. 7 (φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός ἔχθρα εἰς ϑεόν); 2 Cor. vi. 15 (Χριστός and Βελίαρ); Jas. iv. 4 (ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου ἔχθρα τοῦ ϑεοῦ and in this Epistle ch. i. 5 (φῶς and σκοτία). This is the reason of the warning against the love of the world; the love of the world is incompatible with the love of God, as our Father; the love of the world cannot consist with the sonship of God. [Christians are the *children* of God, God is their *Father;* their vocation is to love their *Father*, not to love the world. —M.]. This is explicitly brought out in

Ver. 16. **Because all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.** The connection of this verse with the one preceding by ὅτι=*because*, compels us to emphasize π ᾶ ν; for, because there is *nothing* in the world, the κόσμος, which is of the Father, the love of the world is utterly incompatible with the love of the Father.—Πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ is evidently not identical with τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (v. 15); the Singular denotes the transition from the particular to the unit: what is in the world is conceived as a whole, a totality comprehending the particular; hence the reference is not *to objects only*, as all those maintain who make it identical with τά ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (although Ebrard's exposition correctly adverts to particular forms of demeanour, and Düsterdieck speaks of a "transformation of the conception of the objects of the love of the world into the conception of subjective love itself and its essential modes of representation"); still less to *persons* ("*omnes mundi dilectores non habent nisi concupiscentiam*" Bede); but as Huther excellently puts it: "All that which constitutes the substance, *i. e.* the essence of the κόσμος, its inward life, which animates it." The apposition indicates the nature of πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, and shows how we are to take, and what is the true import of these words. The apposition has obviously respect to life-manifestations in the world of man; the whole, the sum and substance, the totality of those life-manifestations in the God-forsaken world of man, is not of God, but without, and opposed to God. In dealing with the difficulty connected with the exposition of the apposition: ἡ ἐπιϑυμία τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ ἡ ἐπιϑυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου, we have to remember that all the three clauses must be taken as coördinated, and that the Genitive must be construed alike in all three cases. The three ideas are placed in juxtaposition by καί. Hence Düsterdieck errs in making ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς the principal idea governing ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν and ἀλοζονεία τοῦ βίου. This is confirmed by the explanation of the separate ideas. In ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν we have evidently the Genitive of the subject; it cannot mean: lust after the eyes. We have therefore three times the Genitive of the subject. In ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός the Genitive of the subject is analogous to the idea: ἡ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ (Gal. v. 17), and to the grammatical usage of the N. T., where, with the exception of 2 Pet. ii. 10, the Genitive connected with ἐπιθυμία always denotes the subject; but σάρξ denotes here what it signifies elsewhere, *e. g.* in Eph. ii. 3 (ἐπιϑυμίαι τῆς σαρκὸς) 1 Pet. ii. 11 (αἱ σαρκικαὶ ἐπιϑυμίαι), the desire, the lust of the flesh, as suggested by the antithesis of πνεύματι ἄγεσθαι, ἐν πνεύματι περιπατεῖν. Limitations like those of Augustine ("*desiderium earum rerum quæ pertinent ad carnem, sicut cibus et concubitus et cætera hujusmodi*"), Grotius, Baumgarten-Crusius, Sander and Besser, who agree with him, or those of Brückner, who suggests "carnal lust in the strict sense," Bengel ("*ea quibus pascuntur sensus qui appellantur fruitivi: gustus et tactus,*) Gerlach ("every kind of the lust of enjoyment") and Ebrard ("sexual enjoyments")—are not in agreement with the context and more or less arbitrary. Only the limitation required by the coördinated ἐπιϑυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν is justifiable; but even this is an ἐπιϑυμία, and as such equal to the former, yet not τῆς σαρκὸς, but τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν. This ἐπιϑυμία

must not be subordinated to the former (as is done by Lücke, de Wette and Düsterdieck), but it is coördinated with it. Nor must the Genitive be taken at once subjectively and objectively: "the lust of the eyes, and at the same time that, wherein as the sensuous-worldly, the eyes delight themselves" (Brückner). The lust of the eyes has respect to seeing, consequently the lust to see, and to see that which is the object of such lust. Hence Spener explains correctly: "all sinful lust which seeks for enjoyment in the very seeing," and so does Huther: "the desire of seeing that which is unseemly, and the sinful gratification afforded by seeing it." Hence it must not be restricted to "*omnis curiositas in spectaculis, in theatris*" (Augustine, Neander); nor is it sufficient to say with Calvin: "*tam libidinosos aspectus comprehendit, quam vanitatem, quæ in pompis et inani splendore vagatur.*" Nor may it be referred with Bengel to "*ea, quibus tenentur sensus investigativi, oculus sive visus, auditus et olfactus.*" Nor must extraneous ideas be added thereto, so as to make it denote a desire of possession excited by sight (Rickli), or straightforth πλεονεξία (Luther, Socinus, Grotius, Lorinus, Wolf, Baumgarten-Crusius, Gerlach, al.), or even "the whole sphere of the desires of selfishness, envy, covetousness, hatred and revenge" (Ebrard). Thus the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes are arbitrarily distinguished from each other or rather confounded, since the former is taken as sensuality and the latter as covetousness, or *vice versa.* The eyes, instruments of the senses, are preëminently the ministering members of the life of the soul and the spirit: here is flesh, become transparent, whereby surrounding objects and manifestations produce impressions on the life of the soul, and the soul requires insight of them. As the Scripture draws a distinction between grass and the flower of grass, and understands thereby the flesh and the glory of the flesh (1 Pet. i. 24: σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος and πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου), and thus points beyond the nearest sphere of carnal life to the life-sphere of the soul, so we may distinguish the ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός from the ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν in such manner that the former denotes absolute, purely sensuous lust, and the latter lust which through the instrumentality of the soul, points to the spiritual sphere of life. It is noteworthy that as Peter subjoins the words (v. 25) "τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα," so John has almost the identical addition: "ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ μένει εἰς αἰῶνα." Hence the former includes all the desires of possession and enjoyment, of covetousness and sensuality, of vulgar or refined form, while the latter embraces the desire which longs for, seeks and finds gratification in social intercourse and the manifestations of social joys, in works of art down to the rude outbreaks of festal joy.—To this is now added as a third καὶ ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου. While ἐπιθυμία refers twice to *acquisition*, ἀλαζονεία has respect to *spending.* The noun occurs, besides this place, in the N. T. only at Jas. iv. 16: ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονείαις ὑμῶν, the adjective in Rom. i. 30, after, and in 2 Tim. iii. 2, before ὑπερήφανος. In classical Greek it signifies arrogance and vaunting, with the secondary idea of untruthfulness and boasting about one's rank or wealth. In James it evidently denotes the outbreaks of that arrogance which overlooks the vanity and nothingness of earthly happiness, and boastingly confides in it. The ἀλαζών is the vain braggart at whom and with whom one may perhaps smile; the ὑπερήφανος is the haughty man, who is irritable and injurious; the one recognizable in the national character of the French, the other in that of the English. The Genitive τοῦ βίου, of the life, with reference to sustenance and necessaries, as is evident from ch. iii. 17; Mark xii. 44; Luke viii. 14, 43; xv. 12, 30; xxi. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 4, designating occasionally personal property (living), indicates the side on which this braggart arrogance does and is wont to appear, as well where there is little or great abundance as where it is merely coveted and want is concealed; braggart arrogance is wont to appear in connection with bodily sustenance and necessaries. Augustine: "*Jactare se vult in honoribus, magnus sibi videtur, sive de divitiis, sive de aliqua potentia.*" Bengel: "*Ut velit quam plurimus esse in victu, cultu, apparatu, suppellectili, ædificiis, prædiis, famulitio, clientibus, jumentis, muneribus,* etc., Rev. xviii. 12. *Chrysostomus appellat* τὸν τῦφον τὸν βιωτικὸν et τὴν φαντασίαν τοῦ βίου." Examples occur in Gen. xi. 2–4; 1 Chron. xxii. 1, sqq.; Eccles. ii. 1, sqq.; Ezek. xxviii. 12–19; Dan. iv. 27; Rev. xvii. 4–6; xviii, 4–7. So Lücke, Sander, Besser and Huther; Neander, Gerlach and Düsterdieck may be included in this category. Hence it is not correct to restrict the meaning to ambition, *superbia, ambitio* (Cyrillus, Socinus, al.).—We should hold with Bengel that: "*Non coincidunt cum his tribus tria vitia cardinalia, voluptas, avaritia, superbia: sed tamen in his continentur.*" The hypothesis that this trinity contains a complete indication of all the forms in which evil is apt to manifest itself, has become traditional, and goes so far that Bede following Augustine said: "*Per hæc tria tantum cupiditas humana tentatur; per hæc tria Adam tentatus est et victus; per hæc tentatus est Christus et vicit.*" A Lapide actually discovered in them the correlatives of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity answering to the three *primariæ virtutes, continentia, caritas, humilitas* [which according to Huther are closely connected with the three monastic vows of chastity, poverty and obedience.—M.]. The majority of practical expositors have followed this track with various modifications, even Pascal (*Pensées*, 28, 55) says: "*libido sentiendi, sciendi, dominandi.*" Lücke very rightly opposed this interpretation and maintained that the point in question did not relate to cardinal *vices*, but to the chief forms (Brückner; "leading biasses") of worldly-mindedness. These, as Bengel observes, sustain an intimate relation to one another: "*Etiam ii, qui* arrogantiam vitæ *non amant, tamen* concupiscentiam oculorum *sectari possunt, et qui hanc superarunt, tamen* concupiscentiam carnis *persæpe retinent: hæc enim profundissima et communissima, apud minores, medioximos et potentes: apud eos etiam, qui abnegationem sui colere videntur; et rursum, nisi vincatur, ab ea facile progreditur homo ad* concupiscentiam oculorum, *ubi materiam habet; et ab hac ad* superbiam vitæ, *ubi facultatem habet; tertioque includitur secundum, secundo primum.*" Thus ambition is ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός only in so far as it wants to cast others in the shade, it is ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλ-

ιῶν as far as it aims at recognition and marks of recognition, and it is ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου as far as it is indulged in the consciousness of position and wealth, and in every form there are degrees of intensiveness and coarseness. The same holds good of avarice, voluptuousness and the love of pleasure. We have here by no means a complete catalogue of the biasses and forms of manifestation of evil. *Unlovingness* specified above (vv. 2–11) and *mendacity* mentioned below (vv. 18–20) although connected with this [trichotomy M.], are not contained in or denoted by it. Hence Luther, followed by Sander, rightly observes: "These three particulars are not of the Father: 1. Hatred of the brethren. 2. The three idols of the world. 3. False and corrupt doctrine.—The terms ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἶναι denote origin and indicate similarity, congruity and connection. This is the profound truth that nothing is esteemed with God except His own Image; whatever is to have respect to Him, to belong to Him, to be, and able to be united with Him, must come from Him; ch. ii. 29; iii. 7 sqq.; iv. 2 sqq.; 7 sqq.; v. 1 sqq.; Jno. viii. 44. So Düsterdieck, Huther, and Ebrard in opposition to de Wette [Paulus and Baumgarten-Crusius—M.], who deny the reference to origin and restrict the application of the terms to congruity and similarity. The antithesis, intensified by the repetition of ἐστί "*is not of the Father, but is of the world*" marks with peculiar pointedness the *world* as the source of ungodliness. The world will not tolerate any thing that does not derive its being from it or belongs to it. We see therefore how God and the world are just here opposed to each other, irreconciled and irreconcilable; both are inflexible and neither can yield the place to the other. [Düsterdieck: "Through our whole Epistle runs the view which is also manifest in the Gospel of St. John, that only the mind which springs from God is directed to God. He who is born of God, loves God, knows God, does God's will. God Himself, who first loved us, viz. in Christ His incarnate Son, begot in us that love which of moral necessity returns again to the Father, and of like necessity embraces our brethren also. This love is hated by the world, because it springs not from the world. It depends not on the world, any more than that perverted love which springs from the world and is directed towards the world, the lust of the flesh, etc., can be directed to the Father or to God's children. So that John grasps in reality down to the very foundations of the moral life, when he reminds his readers of the essentially distinct origin of the love of the world, and the love of God. The inmost kernel of the matter is hereby laid bare, and with it a glimpse is given of the whole process of the love of the world and the love of God, even to the end; and this end is now set forth expressly with extraordinary power."—M.]. But

The second reason: v. 17.

And the world passeth away and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.—The world can only be taken here in the same sense as in the preceding verses, viz.: the world of man fallen away from and opposing God, which is a power, and as a power awes many, but does and has great things. But what is true of the σκοτία, v. 8, applies also to it: παράγεται, it passeth away, it is passing away and disappearing; the sense must not be limited to the transitory world, to be destroyed in the judgment (Bede: "*mundus transibit, quum in die judicii per ignem in meliorem mutabitur figuram, ut sit cœlum novum et terra nova*"), nor must the term be so construed as to express the consciousness of the approaching advent of Christ and the judgment of the κόσμος connected with it (Luther, with reference to vv. 8. 18: ἐσχάτη ὥρα). It is, in effect, the uninterruptedly peculiar nature and destiny of the world (Oecumenius: "τὰ κοσμικὰ ἐπιθυμήματα οὐκ ἔχει τὸ μένον τε καὶ ἑστὼς, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ διακρῆ καὶ διαιωνίζοντα (Düsterdieck: "because of its alienation from God, doomed to *passing away*, to death"). The antithesis μένει requires and confirms this view. Although Düsterdieck distinguishes his view, according to which he finds here more permanently valid axiomatic truths concerning the course of the love of God or the love of the world, from that of Oecumenius, who gives prominence to the properties of the love of the world and of the obedience to the commandments of God, the two views ought really to be combined thus: it fares with the world according to its nature, and the nature of the world agrees with its passing away. And as it passes away, so also passes away its lust, the lust which inheres in it, emanates from it, and governs it. Hence αὐτοῦ is the Genitive of the subject, as maintained by most commentators; it cannot mean lust after it or in it, as if αὐτοῦ were the Genitive of the object (Lücke, Neander, Sander, Besser, al.). Of course, the lust of the world refers also to the world and the things and manifestations in it, and not to God and the riches of His Kingdom. If the whole, the world, belonging to death, passes away, then also its parts, the life that is in it, its separate manifestations and exhibitions of life in individuals, must pass away. This makes one thoroughly loathe the love of the world—the ἀγαπᾷν τὸν κόσμον. Who wants to seize and hold as the object of his love that which is perishable, doomed to death and perpetual defeat? The clause ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ supplies not only an antithesis, but affirms that the ἐπιθυμία τοῦ κόσμου does not the will of God, that the ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρός shows and verifies itself in the ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, even as unfolded in vv. 3, sqq., that the child does not trifle with the will of the Father, for the Father is God. To such applies the μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, the antithesis of παράγεται, he abides therefore unto, into eternity, sharing and assured of the imperishable and beatific life; redeemed from θάνατος, from the σκοτία, he gains φῶς, ζωὴ αἰώνιος. [Huther: "The destiny of the κόσμος is θάνατος, that of the children of God ζωὴ αἰώνιος."—M.]. This antithesis points to the fact that the παράγεται of the world will sooner or later have run its course, and that the world will have ceased to exist. Most singular and arbitrary is the opinion of Ebrard, who says that "αἰών is the æon which will gloriously begin with the visible establishment of Christ's Kingdom on earth," and that consequently ὁ ποιῶν—εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα signifies that "he that does the will of God will abide until then, until the Kingdom of Christ is established,

and be suffered to witness the victory of Christ's Kingdom." The addition, "*quomodo et deus manet in æternum,*" found in several Latin translations, but not in Jerome's, is rather remarkable.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The gift of the forgiveness of sins (v. 12), which is, at the same time, the gift of adoption, [of being made the child of God—M.], v. 13c, establishes a relationship which must verify itself in corresponding conduct, in the way of sanctification. God *has* taken the initiative, but man must seize it and hold fast, keep and verify it in striving after more profound knowledge, and in struggling for the peace of victory. On the gift of the forgiveness of our sins, and on that of our adoption with the Father, rest the more intimate knowledge of Christ, the victorious fight against Satan, and the enjoyment of the fruits of victory. In the fellowship with the Father and the Son are given us life, light, forgiveness, truth, wisdom, and understanding, and victory over the world and the devil. The victory of Christ (John xvi. 33) is the presupposition of all true victories, and His victory must continue in ours. John grounds the duties of Church members on the high privileges and immunities of the Christian state, and makes *gratitude* the principle of morality.

2. The peace-work of profound meditation and mature knowledge in men can only take place and prove successful if preceded by the struggles and triumphs of young men [i. e., the *man* must have passed through the discipline of the *young man.*—M.]. Great purity and integrity are indispensable to the clear perception and more thorough knowledge of the glory of Christ, of His Person, His Word, and His work. True knowledge presupposes life in fellowship with the Person known; it is a living reality and not a mere dogmatical formula (concerning the Person of Christ). Nothing but fighting against Satan will facilitate our knowledge of the eternal glory of Christ.

3. The κόσμος is diametrically opposed to God, and the heart of man cannot combine the love of the world and the love of the Father; the latter cannot thrive because of the former, or the former must be overcome, and disappearing, yield the place to the latter in the course of its growth and development. Where the life of [emanating from —M.] God is extant there may still be the world, but its power must be broken, it must wane more and more, and its still surviving remainder must recede before increasing and waxing knowledge and joy. Worldly life and godly life are not only two different biasses, but two opposite inclinations, incompatible and destroying each other.

4. It is not in point of space that we must flee from the world, but it is with reference to ethical principles that we must shun it, without loving it, turned away from it, to prevent our dying and perishing in and with it; some one thing may so effectually lay hold of one or another as to sweep him along with the fearful destruction of the whole κόσμος.

5. The definite superiority of the divine to the worldly may be gathered from the transitoriness of the world. Here is "afforded a vista through the whole process of the world's history, as well as of the love of God, right on to the end" (Düsterdieck), and at the same time an insight into the biography of individuals.

6. He that has separated himself from God, has estranged himself from Him, falls into the power of death; the world contains death in the love of itself. None but those who love the Father have the life; yet none love the Father but those who have and with true fidelity keep His word. But there exists no eternal kingdom of evil, the principially dualistic predisposition to evil, but only a condition which has become so, from which any and every man may and shall be redeemed, who does not offer any resistance.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The gift of the forgiveness of sins sets us the task of fighting against the destroyer, and acquiring the knowledge of the Saviour. The gift of the forgiveness of sins is sonship with God and the knowledge of the Father. Holy Scripture directs us first to the knowledge of sin, then to fight against and overcome the wicked one, and lastly to acquire the knowledge of the God-man. Holy Scripture addresses first children—that is to say, the children of God; the word of God is the word of the Father to His children; the word of God calls all, whom it addresses, children, because He is the Father of all. Young men and fathers cannot go beyond this *child*-ship [I retain this Germanism in this place in order to render the thought more perspicuous; neither the word sonship nor adoption conveys the precise shade of thought.—M.]. No age of life can or may desire to surpass the stage of childhood before God. The life-truth of the Gospel is only one, emanating from one Spirit, resting on one foundation, consisting in one Spirit, but like the sun, shedding its illuminating and vitalizing beams in all directions: away with all false individualizing and all dry moralizing! He that loves not the world in God as the object of redemption to its salvation, loves it only without God to his own perdition. The world, which thou lovest, reacts more on thee than thou art able to influence it; thou wilt sooner become worldly through it, than it will become Christian through thee. Shun not the world, but love it not; be not afraid of it, but be afraid of thy love of it.

Bodmer:—John the Apostle survived twelve Roman emperors: Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasianus, Titus, Domitianus and Nerva; great expectations and hopes were entertained of each one of these lords of the world, but all failed in the case of the best of them: instead of healing, they inflicted wounds, and many came to a miserable end.

Gerson:—*Amor habet vim uniendi, si terram amas, terrenus es; si deum, divinus.*

Spener:—Every age should diligently cultivate the virtue becoming it before others, which is especially done by each particular age applying its natural gifts to the growth of life (understanding in the case of the old, strength in the case of young men, simplicity in the case of children).—Those who have overcome Satan as young men, may afterwards truly and fully know Christ as fathers, while those who have served

him do not easily attain such knowledge, which is a kind of reward of grace.—The word of God does not only *come to us*, but *abides* also *in us*, and consequently is not a dead or passing sound.—That which does not abide forever is not worthy of our love; for God has created, appointed and called us unto eternal things.

STARKE:—Preachers should particularly urge obedience to the commandments of God, and renunciation of the love of the world on the plea of the grace of God in the forgiveness of sins, as a more powerful incentive than considerations founded on the Law.—Although you have conquered the devil once, he will return and assault you with sevenfold strength to rob you of your crown. Therefore, ye warriors of Jesus, grow not secure, but think that your task is not done with one well-fought battle.—O the deluded souls that fancy that it is the privilege of their rank to use the world at their pleasure, to lead a worldly and carnal life, and to be good Christians for all! They will terribly deceive themselves, for the mere name is not sufficient.—Christians, would you love the Father, you must content yourselves with the necessaries of the body, bridle your eyes, and lead a life of simplicity.—The world and its lusts pass swiftly away, like an arrow cuts through the air, like smoke blows away, like a river flows along, like a bird flies past, like a sound dies away. What folly to set one's hope and pleasure on such changeable and transitory things!—It is well, but not enough to know the will of God, we must do it in the strength of God, with all diligence, at all times, in all things, if we would abide forever.—It is a great mercy of God that He accepts our poor, imperfect doing, provided it be done with a childlike heart, as the doing of His will.—None can do the will of God without denying his own will, for the will of God and corruptible self-will are utterly opposed to each other.

HEUBNER:—*Fathers* are spiritual adults, matured Christians; they have known Christ, the Son of God, from personal experience, made proof of His power, or He has been fully formed in them (Eph. iv. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 7, 11; Heb. v. 14). The image of Christ has a feeble and tender beginning in childhood; it continues growing in youth, but does not attain perfect clearness with open face until manhood. No warrior can go beyond this: Christ and His knowledge excel all perfection. We have here the case of souls that long since have acquired forgiveness and cleansing from their sins, overcome the wicked one, stood severe trials and hard conflicts, in victory have been planted in the likeness of Christ's death, and made experience of the power of His resurrection. As *fathers* they possess *spiritual generative powers*. They are the mellow old wine. They are called τέλειοι, they are the nearest friends of the Lord, His intimates, that have a better understanding of His counsel: but, although thus highly raised by God, they never divest themselves of their childlike disposition. The sense of redemption in Christ, true poverty of spirit, voluntary and constant self-denial and strong love are their characteristics. But they still stand in need of instruction and caution (an *old* Christian had been victorious in the fight for thirty-nine years, but was overcome in the fortieth year.) They must fight *senectute contra senectutem*. They have more works than words. They are engaged in ceaseless intercessions for all the people of God, and gather riches for the children (2 Cor. xii. 14). But they must be very careful not to usurp an authority and power, in virtue of which they require others blindly and unconditionally to follow and agree with them; the moment they fall into this snare they cease to be fathers, and become the destroyers of the Christlike spirit in the children.—*Young men* are those who are still engaged in active warfare, and have to fear most the assaults of the flesh, the world and the devil; they ought to have begun to taste the better delights [of religion] and should overcome Satan. Hence they are always prepared for the battle. He that has become a true child of God must not care for the age of youth. Can any one, by anxious care, add one cubit unto his stature [age]? He that preserves that which he has, to him shall be given more; the process of growth is imperceptible (Mark iv. 28). They ought to have the spirit of power and vigilance; as valiant soldiers they must always be at their post, warring against the enemy. Their dangers are rashness, undue ardor, temerity and negligence. They must have work to do, they must destroy Babylon, but abstain from all things, and fight faithfully unto death. They must not be discouraged in the first ardor of their zeal, for that first ardor may lose its intensity. Their strength will be in proportion to their allowing their strength quietly to strike root; even Christ walked in silence and retirement during His youth, and John was in the wilderness. They must learn to enter into the mystery of godliness, abstain from *their* doing in order that *God may work in them*, that thus they may resist the πονηρός, the spoiler, who comes from without and forces his way into them, and would fain seize the youthful warriors. Hence they need circumspection and weapons (Eph. vi).—*Children* are beginners in Christianity who have already tasted the paternal love of God, who receive from the Father more tokens of love, as it were, more caressing. But they must be truly born of God, have a new mind, the Spirit of adoption whereby they cry Abba, Father. Their general characteristics are these: a childlike disposition, lowliness, obedience, sincerity, joyfulness. Their childlike failings are: credulity, carelessness, rashness, inconstancy, or even wandering from the simplicity in Christ. They are strongly attached to the sweet taste of grace. They require oversight, guidance, nursing, care, keeping; they require milk until they are able to take stronger food and grow. (Here we may refer to the choral divisions among the *unitas fratrum:* children, older boys, single brethren, single sisters, the chorus of married people, widowers and widows, to the *incipientes*, *proficientes* and *profecti* of the Moravians, and to the analogies of paganism, Plato *de legg.* II., where the chorus of boys, of young men to the age of thirty, of men to the age of sixty, used fascinatingly to implant the true and the good into the minds of the people in songs, and Plutarch *lacon. instit.* according to which, among the Spartans, *old men* used to sing: "Once we were vigorous youths;" *men*, "We are so; if thou de-

sirest it, try;" and the *boys*, "Some day we shall even be better").—*Love* is the noblest power in man, which he ought not to waste on unworthy objects, but he ought to love God only.—The world is set before men to try them, whether they will lay hold of it or of heavenly things.—The objects of our desires, as far as they are creatures, are not evil in themselves (1 Tim. iv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 26), but the passionate desire of them is evil, and of the evil spirit. The *excusatio* of worldlings is: "it is natural, it is innocent." That is to lay the responsibility of sin on God.—Worldly-mindedness and religion are incompatible. There are, indeed, many degrees of this worldly-mindedness and fondness of worldly pleasures, but this much is certain: 1. Those in whom this fondness is strong and supreme, to whom non-gratification causes anger and a blank, are without the divine life. 2. Every worldly pleasure, though indifferent of itself, becomes sin if it leads astray from God, and has to be enjoyed without God. 3. In proportion to the growth of religion is the decrease of a mind and taste for worldly lusts, and *vice versa*.—It is disgraceful in clergymen [Germ. *Geistliche*, a technical term for clergymen, of which the English *divines* is the nearest approximation, or we may also say "*spiritual* and *secular*," but, of course, without any reference to the Roman Catholic use of these terms—M.], who ought to be the opposite of the worldly, to exhibit worldliness in the bias of their mind and conversation.—What comes of the transitoriness of the world and of the things which lust desires? What harm does it do to the worldly? 1. Even in respect of this earthly life it is painful and humiliating to take pleasure in enjoyments which are wholly idle and transient, and leave behind them nothing that is refreshing or ennobling, but, perhaps, something that will fill the mind with gloom, paralyze and deject the spirit—a melancholy blank. 2. This holds good still more in respect of the life to come. The objects will cease, but not the desire, which will then lack the instruments and means of its gratification. Painful condition. Such a soul will then behold itself in its miserable emptiness and vileness. Therefore consider the transitoriness and consequences of every sinful lust. (Oriental saying: The treasures of the world are so constituted that they will deprive thee of life, if thou gatherest them).—

NEANDER:—It is not part of the nature of the love of God that we must retire from the world and worldly things, but rather that we should use them according to the purpose which God has assigned to all men, to His glory.

BESSER:—The forgiveness of sins is the bread on which the great and the small, Apostles and malefactors, the wise and the illiterate, kings and beggars (kings as beggars, and beggars as kings), live in the kingdom of God, even as the fourth and fifth petitions of the Lord's Prayer are significantly joined together by *and*.

JOHANN BUGENHAGEN's motto was: "*Si Christum bene scis, satis est, si cetera nescis: si Christum nescis, nil est, si cetera discis.*"

LEO THE GREAT:—There are two kinds of love from which proceeds every lust according to its kind: man, who cannot exist without love, loves either God or the world.

SPENER.—This *either—or* is an established thing which will never yield the place to an *as well—as*. To contribute one cent to ungodliness is as much as to give up to it the whole. St. Bernard calls pride the arch-artificer of fraud, and the true fountain of vice, the tinder of sin, the rust of virtues, the moth of holiness, the beguiler of hearts, that turns medicine into poison, and cordials into stupefying draughts. A soul has nothing in eternity but what it has gathered in time.

NITZSCH:—The principal question of the divine word addressed to fathers: Do you know Him that is from the beginning? Let us consider: 1. Why this question is peculiarly suited to the *aged?* The excellency and glory of old age is experience, its natural avocation to gather and to have gathered it, its supreme requirement to have wisdom by and in experience. How much more important is it to have *seen* and *felt* a thing, to have *shared* its suffering, than merely to have *heard of it!* 2. Which *knowledge* does it speak of? The First and the Last has been revealed in the centre of history, He by whom and for whom all things consist; time has become conscious of eternity. Humanity has been raised from profound misery to high glory. This knowledge compensates the eye for every unavoidable want of light, supplies the solution of many riddles, finds the kernel of many experiences, marks the holy line of human effort, cherishes the sweet hope of beholding [God], and thinks well done that which God doeth. 3. The great *monition* and the glorious *consolation* contained therein. Many things improve by age, but not the fundamental error, erring from God. Self-will and unbelief do not break spontaneously by mere events; the secret will of the natural man grows to a fearful height and resoluteness; rather die in sins than present oneself blind and naked, miserable and poor before the only Mediator, the Conqueror on the cross. Do you *still* know Him, do you know Him *again?* Be overcome and ye shall conquer; His knowledge rejuvenates you like eagles, makes you wise, and crowns all knowledge and experience with faith in the eternal words. *The monition of the divine word to young men that they have overcome the wicked one.* Regard it—1, as a *congratulation on their participation in the victory of Christ*, but also as *a threefold test-inquiry of the reality of their Christianity.* After the victory of Christ, the time of the mere doubtful struggle between the death and life of mankind, the time of invincible sin, of the immeasurable progress of corruption, belongs to the remote past. If you fear *already*, or are *still* afraid in this world, be of good courage and know that you enter into a reconciled world, and stand in eternal peace, and partake of a happiness and liberty that have not to be fought for and devised, but may be seized and enjoyed in true faith. But here you have to *inquire after faith in this word*,—since the tendency prevails not to believe that which was believed by the fathers; many, all believe to indemnify themselves for childlike faith with the conceits of the unvanished beauty of the world, of the power of the mind of man and of the innocence and goodness of the heart of man,—to inquire after the *knowledge* of this truth, after the *decision and conversion of the heart*, whether that

will reigns supreme which says, How should I do this great evil and sin against my God? whether you are consciously or unconsciously under the jurisdiction of the prince of this world, and unfitted for the true work of your calling. . . . 2. As *a call to resistance*, and at the same time as a *promise of assistance*. This bears on your bravery, your honour, your independence, ye that are in such hurry to be men. There are many adversaries from without that reappear again and again; fight the invisible battles in your souls. It is good for a man to have worn the yoke in his youth, but how much better this yoke; thus you will gain a clear and pure view of your future, thus you spend the time of your transitory youth for the purpose of securing eternal youth, thus you care to-day for to-morrow and ever, even unto the judgment; all things are yours.

Hast thou broken with the world? 1. Art thou perhaps still wholly entangled in its lust? 2. Art thou convinced that it is impossible to love God and the world at the same time? 3. Dost thou daily fight victoriously against the lust of the world tempting thee?

What is the Christian's relation to the world? 1. He knows that its lust, without any exception, is sin (v. 16), and such sin as is incompatible with the Christian profession (v. 15), and on this very account 2. He shuns and flies it (v. 15).

Consider how little the love of the world comports with sincere conversion towards God. 1. The latter imposes renunciation of the world and its lust as a necessary condition. 2. It affords strength for overcoming the world. 3. And is itself a continued combat with the temptations of the world.

The infamy of a Christian being the slave of worldly lust. 1. He thereby enters the service of worldly vanity, 2. becomes the enemy of God, and 3. will perish with the world (L. in "*Gesetz und Zeugniss*" for 1860).—

[Ezekiel Hopkins:—v. 15. "For these things (Pleasures, Riches, Honours), though they make a fair and gaudy show, yet it is all but show and appearance. As bubbles, blown into the air, will represent great variety of orient and glittering colours, not, as some suppose, that there are any such really there, but only they appear so to us, through a false reflection of light cast upon them: so truly this world, this earth on which we live, is nothing else but a great bubble blown up by the breath of God in the midst of the air, where it now hangs. It sparkles with ten thousand glories: not that they are so in themselves, but only they seem so to us through the false light by which we look upon them. If we come to grasp it, it breaks and leaves nothing but wind and disappointment in our hands: as histories report of the fruits that grow near the Dead sea, where once Sodom and Gomorrah stood, they appear very fair and beautiful to the eye, but if they be crushed, turn straight to smoke and ashes."

There is nothing in the world vain in respect of its natural being or of God the Creator—but all the vanity that is in worldly things, is only in respect of the sin and folly of man. [Augustine: "*Utendum est hoc mundo, non fruendum; ut invisibilia Dei, per ea quæ facta sunt, intelligantur; hoc est, ut de temporalibus æterna capiantur.*"—M.]. The vanity of the world appears in:

1. That all its glory and splendour depend merely on opinion and fancy.

2. In its deceitfulness and treachery. It is not only vanity, but a lying vanity.

3. As all things in the world are lying vanities, so are they all vexatious. "Uncertain comforts but most certain crosses."

4. A little cross will embitter great comforts—another mark of the vanity of the world.

5. The longer we enjoy any worldly thing, the more flat and insipid doth it grow.

6. All the pleasure of the world is nothing else but a tedious repetition of the same things.

7. The world can stand us in no stead, when we have the greatest need of support and comfort.

8. All things in the world are vain, because they are unsuitable.

The soul is spiritual and immortal, worldly things are material and perishable.

Its wants are spiritual—but the world supplies only material wants.

9. The vanity of the world appears in its inconstancy and fickleness and—

10. In that it is altogether unsatisfactory.—M.].

[Barrow:—The *world* is an enemy, an irreconcilable enemy to our salvation. The world, that is, the wicked principles, the bad customs, the naughty conversation and example which commonly prevail here among men; alluring to evil and deterring from good; the cares also, the riches, the pleasures, the glories of the world, which possess or distract the minds, satiate and cloy the desires, employ all the affections and endeavours, take up the time of men; all in the world which fasteneth our hearts to earth, and to those low transitory things; or which sink them down toward hell and which detain them from soaring toward heaven.

The world passeth away and the desire (ἐπιθυμία) *thereof;* whatever seemeth most lovely and desirable in the world is very flitting; however, our desire and our enjoyment thereof must suddenly cease. Imagine a man, therefore, possessed of all worldly goods, armed with power, flourishing in credit, flowing with plenty, swimming in all delight (such as were sometime Priamus, Polycrates, Crœsus, Pompey) yet since he is withal supposed a man, and mortal, subject both to fortune and death, none of those things can he reasonably confide or much satisfy himself in; they may be violently divorced from him by fortune, they must naturally be loosed from him by death; the closest union here cannot last longer than till death us depart; wherefore no man upon such account can truly call, or, if he consider well, heartily esteem himself happy; a man cannot hence receive profit or content from any labour he taketh under the sun. (Eccles. i. 8 sqq.)—M.].

[On ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου v. 16. "It was a pertinent discourse of Cineas, dissuading Pyrrhus from undertaking a war against the Romans. Sir, saith he, when you have conquered them, what will you do next? Then Sicily is near at hand, and easy to master.—And what when you have subdued Sicily? Then we will pass over

to **Africa and take** Carthage, which cannot long withstand us.—When these are conquered, what will be your next attempt?—Then we will fall in upon Greece and Macedon and recover what we have lost there.—Well, when all are subdued, what fruit do you expect from all your victories? Then we will sit down and enjoy ourselves. Sir, replied Cineas, may we not do it now? Have you not already a kingdom of your own? and he that cannot enjoy himself with a kingdom, cannot with the world." Plutarch *in Vita Pyrrhi.*—M.].

[PYLE (v. 12–14):—The cautions I here give you ought to be equally regarded by all degrees of Christian professors. The new converts and younger Christians are to consider themselves as newly put into a state of salvation, the pardon of sin, and the favour of God, through Jesus Christ; and to endeavour to confirm themselves in it by the careful practice of true Christian virtue. Such as are come to more maturity in their profession and are in the strength and vigour of their age, have a great advantage, and ought to employ the utmost of that vigour in resisting the strongest temptations of the devil, and perfecting their conquest over him and all his wicked instruments. And the aged Christians cannot but have so dear a knowledge of God, and the revelation of His will by Jesus Christ, during the long season from their first conversion, that it would be utterly inexcusable for them to be wanting in their essential duties or be drawn from them by the false teachers.—M.].

[VER. 12. SIMEON, C., The different growth and privileges of God's children. Works xx. 398.

VV. 13. 14. MARSHALL, N., Peculiar temptations attending every stage of life, with the special advantages and counter-motives that are found in each, considered particularly with regard to old age.

The temptations that most endanger our first stage of life, with the duties most incumbent upon us in that early period, and the motives to discharge them.

Peculiar temptations treated in reference to such as are in the bloom and vigour of life. Sermons, iv. 433, 459, 485.

VER. 15. FULLER, THOS., An ill match well broken off. Joseph's party-coloured coat.

VV. 15–17. BOSSUET, Traité de la Concupiscence. Œuvres, xiv. 26.—M.].

---

7. *Warning and consolation against Anti-Christ.*

DESCRIPTION OF HIS FORERUNNERS, WHOSE APPEARANCE POINTS TO THE LAST TIME (VV. 18–28). EXHORTATION OF THE FAITHFUL TO STEADFASTNESS IN THEIR ASSURANCE OF POSSESSING THE TRUTH AND ETERNAL LIFE (V. 24–28).

CHAPTER ii, 18–28.

18 Little children, it is the last time[1], and as ye have heard that[2] antichrist[3] shall come,
even now are[4] there many antichrists; whereby[5] we know that it is the last time[6].
19 They went out from us[7], but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they
would *no doubt*[8] have continued[9] with us: but *they went out*[10], that they might be
20 made manifest that they were[11] not all of us. But[12] ye have an[13] unction from the
21 Holy One, and ye[14] know all things[15]. I have not written unto you because ye know
22 not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth[16]. Who is
a[17] liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He[18] is antichrist, that
23 denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever[19] denieth the Son, the same hath not
24 the Father[20]: [*but*] *he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also*[21]. Let that
therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning[22]. If that which ye
have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son,
25 and in the Father[23]. And this is the promise that he[24] hath promised us[25], *even* eternal
26 life[26]. These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you[27].
27 But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you[28], and ye need not
that any man teach you: but as the same[29] anointing teacheth you of all things, and
28 is truth[30], and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him[31]. And
now, little children, abide in him; that when[32] he shall appear[33], we may have[34] confidence, and not be ashamed before him[35] at his coming.

Verse 18. [1 ἐσχάτη ὥρα—the last *hour*.—M.]
2 B. C. Sin. read ὅτι after ἠκούσατε. *Est lectio difficilior.*
3 B. C. Sin. omit the Article before ἀντίχριστος. In Sin. it is clearly a later addition. It would hardly have been omitted, had it been originally there. [Lachm. Tisch. Buttm. reject it.—M.]
[4 German: "Even now have there come into existence" Lillie: "even now are there many *become*."—M.]
[5 ὅθεν—whence.—M.]
[6 German: "that there is a last hour." Lillie: "that it is the last hour."—M.]
Verse 19. [7 Better to retain the Greek order with German: "From us they went out."—ἐξῆλθαν, A. B. C. Lach. Tisch. Buttm. Huther, is more authentic than ἐξῆλθον G. K., but less common.—M.]

[[8] *No doubt* supplied by E. V. is arbitrary and unnecessary.—M.]

[[9] No reason why μεμενήκεισαν should be rendered "*continued*," since "abode" makes as good sense here as other forms of the same verb in other places. Better to render μένειν uniformly *abide*.—M.]

[[10] German: "but—that they might be made manifest," *i. e.* nothing is supplied, although the context requires something to be supplied. E. V. supplies "they went out," Beza, following the Syriac "*egressi sunt ex nobis*," Wakefield: "this was done," Newcome, "this hath come to pass," Lillie "it was," etc. See below in Exeget. and Critical.—M.]

[[11] German: "that not all are from us" better than the more inferential rendering advocated by Lillie "that none of them are of us," and the less correct translation of E. V. "that they *were* not all of us."

Verse 20. [[12] German: "And." There seems to be no necessity for "but," although καί may here have slightly adversative force.—M.]

[[13] German omits the Article before unction and renders "and ye have unction."—M.]

[[14] German omits "ye;" B. omits καί before οἴδατε.—M.]

[15] B. Sin read πάντες instead of πάντα, August. "*Ut ipsi vobis manifesti sint.*"

Verse 21. [[16] German: "and that every thing which is lie is not out of the truth," but the rendering of E. V. is a happy inferential translation of the Greek idiom.—M.]

Verse 22. [[17] German: "who is *the* liar." The Article is emphatic here and must be retained.—M.]

[[18] German: "This is the antichrist, who." οὗτος has demonstrative force.—M.]

Verse 23. [[19] German: "Every one that denieth;" *omnis qui*, Vulg. Aug. Calv. Bengel, and "every one that" Greenfield, Allioli, de Wette, Lillie.—M.]

[[20] German: "Hath also not the Father." Better render with *Rhemish* and most foreign versions "neither hath he the Father."—M.]

[21] A. B. C. Sin. [Griesb., Scholz, Lachm., Tisch. Buttm. Wordsw. Lillie.—M.] have the final clause: "ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει," and it is required by the parallel passage 2 Jno. 9 as well as by John's fondness of antithesis. [ὁμολογῶν however should be rendered "confesseth" and not "acknowledgeth" as in E. V.—M.]

Verse 24. [[22] German: "You, that which ye have heard from the beginning, let that abide in you." In this rendering οὖν is left out; but the emphatic *you*, in the sense of *as for you*, is decidedly in favour of the German rendering; translate, "you, let that which ye have heard from the beginning, *abide* in you."—A. B. C. Sin. Vulg. al. omit οὖν. M.]

[[23] German: "If that *abide* in you which ye have heard from the beginning, ye also shall *abide* in the Son and in the Father." The three-fold rendering of μένω in one verse: "*abide*, *remain*, *continue*," adopted in E. V. should by all means be avoided. Lillie calls this sacrificing of the simple beauty and force of the original to "a great number of good English" words an "unprofitable exuberance."—M.]

Verse 25. [[24] German: "And this is the promise which He *Himself*;" αὐτός. The reference seems to be to an *oral* promise.—M.]

[25] A. C. Sin. read ἡμῖν. The context warrants the transition to the Plural.

[[26] German: "*The* eternal life." The supplement in E. V. is hardly necessary, the Article is indispensable and the order "life eternal" seems preferable; see on the last point E. V. Matth. xxv. 46; Jno. iv. 36; xvii. 3; Rhemish version, Wakef. Macknight, Berleburg Bible, and Lillie.—M.]

Verse 26. [[27] πλανώντων ὑμᾶς, "who would deceive you." "The context (vv. 20. 21. 27) shows that this is a case of the Present '*de conatu*, *i. e.* an *endeavour* or *purpose*' (Buttm. § 137. n. 10), and so it is generally understood." Lillie.—M.]

Verse 27. [[28] German: "And you—the ointment which ye received from Him, abideth in you."—M.]

[29] τὸ αὐτοῦ χρίσμα is the reading of C. Sin., many versions (Syr. *unctio quæ est a Deo*) and fathers instead of τὸ αὐτὸ χρῖσμα A. B. G. K. and the Greek fathers.—Cod. Sin. reads really πνεῦμα afterwards corrected into χρῖσμα [or χάρισμα]; B reads χάρισμα. [But both in point of authority and in point of sense τὸ αὐτὸ χρῖσμα seems to be the right reading. German, following the less authentic reading, renders "but as the ointment of Him;" E. V. follows τὸ αὐτὸ χρῖσμα.—M.]

[[30] καὶ ἀληθές ἐστι—and is true, better than "and is truth" of E. V.—M.]

[31] The reading μένετε A. B. C. Sin. is on external and internal grounds preferable to μενεῖτε [G. K. al. Tisch.—M.]

Verse 28. [32] A. B. C. Sin. read ἵνα ἐὰν instead of ἵνα ὅταν [G. K. Theoph. Oecum. Tisch.—M.]

[[33] German: "shall be manifested" decidedly preferable both for the sake of uniformity and on doctrinal grounds ("the agency and love of the Father in the second as well as the first coming of the Saviour" Lillie) to "when He shall appear" E. V.—M.]

[34] σχῶμεν.—B and Cod. Sin. give it as a correction of ἔχωμεν.

[[35] German: "and not be put to shame away from Him in His coming." Calvin: *Pudefiamus ab ejus præsentiâ;* Steph. *ab eo discedamus pudefacti;* Hammond: "Turned with shame from Him;" Green and Bloomfield: "shrink from Him with shame;" Peile: "put to confusion of face *as being* cast away from Him." Wordsworth: "Driven to shame from Him;" Lillie: "Shamed away from Him at His coming."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The connection. The groundwork on which this portion of the Epistle rests is contained in the individualized addresses (v. 12–14), introducing both warning and consolation against the love of the world (v. 15–17), as well as in the subsequent warning and consolation against antichrist (v. 18–28). As the former particularly connected with the final clause νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν whose kingdom is ὁ κόσμος, so this connects with ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, τὸν πατέρα, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένει. The opening words ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν in the sequel (v. 18) connect also with ὁ κόσμος παράγεται (v. 17). This portion which began (ch. i. 5 sq.) with the Light-Being of God and the Light-walk of believers, concludes with a warning against the lie which is directed against the fundamental pillar of eternal truth, the glory of Christ, and an exposure of its attempt to annihilate the promise of eternal life. The *address* παιδία, v. 18, applies to all the readers of the Epistle, and requires us to consider the sequel addressed to the whole Church (contrary to Bengel). It is incomprehensible that Ebrard on account of the peculiarly childlike character of this section should hold the opinion that the reference is only to the little ones, to children.

The last hour, v. 18. This important and difficult idea, which is liable to many interpretations and has been variously understood, can only be understood and explained with reference to the whole *usus loquendi* current and the sum-total of clear views on the subject contained in the New Testament. It is not sufficient to refer the reader to Lange on Matth. xxiv., Moll on Heb. i. 1, and Fronmüller on 1 Pet. i. 5. 20. Compare particularly Riehm, *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs*, pp. 72 sqq.; 204 sqq., and Düsterdieck *ad loc.*—The representation of two ages of the world is rooted in the Old Testament idea

בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים which constantly recurs in prophetical passages, beginning with the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 1), especially in Jeremiah, denotes "the most distant future, beyond which the eye cannot penetrate" (Hitzig on Mich. iv. 1), and is therefore well rendered by "in the end of the days." The prophets use it almost exclusively to denote the Messianic times. The LXX. translate it ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (Is. ii. 2), ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν (Gen. xlix. 1), ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν (Numb. xxiv. 14), ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ τῶν ἡμερῶν (Deut. iv. 30), ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν (Deut. xxxi. 29). Hence comes primarily the *talmudical* and *rabbinical* idea of the עוֹלָם הַזֶּה and the עוֹלָם הַבָּא; inside these two ages of the world are the יְמוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ, the days of the Messiah, *the Messianic age proper*, which is alternately counted with either age of the world, and consequently may be either *after* or *before* the end of the days, or *the end* of the days itself. The Lord Himself distinguishes ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι from ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (Matth. xii. 30), ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ from ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ (Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30); and this distinction, as well as Luke xx. 34, sq. (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γαμοῦσιν—οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν) show most plainly that the earthly development-period of the kingdom of God preceding the second coming of Christ in glory, and beginning with the first coming of Christ in the flesh, belongs to the first age of the world, and that the future time is the time of the completed kingdom of God. According to this ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα (Jno. vi. 39, 40, 44, 54; xi. 24; xii. 48) is the day of the resurrection of the dead and the judgment, the last day of the first age of the world and the transition to the second. The turning-point between both ages of the world is *the time of Christ's return to judgment* (Matth. xiii. 39 sq.; 49; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20). Thus Paul also contrasts ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ with ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι, and the sufferings τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ with the μέλλουσα δόξα (Rom. viii. 18), and describes Christians as living ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι looking for the blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ (Tit. ii. 12. 13). The ἔσχαται ἡμέραι in which there shall come καιροὶ χαλεποὶ (2 Tim. iii. 1), and the ὕστεροι καιροί (1 Tim. iv. 1), like the αἰῶνες οἱ ἐπερχόμενοι (Eph. ii. 7), denote the period immediately preceding the second coming of Christ. While, according to Paul, Christians still live outwardly *in* the first age of the world, yet are they *ethically* beyond it and the character of this present age of the world is described by him as tainted with immorality and alienation from God, Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. ii. 6. 8; iii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Gal. i. 4; Eph. ii. 2; 2 Tim. iv 10. He regarded also the present age of the world as running on towards its end since the first coming of Christ; hence he speaks of τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων (1 Cor. x. 11) having set in. We have not to inquire here whether he regarded the second coming of Christ to be near at hand.—Peter considers his time as the ἔσχαται ἡμέραι (Acts ii. 17) and laid the first coming of Christ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων (1 Pet. i. 20 cf. v. 5: ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ or τῶν ἡμερῶν, 2 Pet. iii. 3 cf. Jude 18).—So also James: (v. 13: ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις).—In the Epistle to the Hebrews also the close of the first age of the world is described as beginning with the first coming of Christ (ch. i. 1), but the συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων denotes the turning-point of the two ages of the world, ch. ix. 26, and this turning-point is more particularly described as found in the sacrificial death of Christ on account of its important consequences (ch. x. 14; xi. 39. 40), since that which is eternal, is now extant (Χριστὸς—ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν ch. ix. 11; cf. v. 14; x. 1. 18; vi. 5; xii. 22). The beginning of the new time has set in, but only the ideal and objective beginning; since the αἰὼν μέλλων as to the δύναμις is already extant in the redeemed, but will not enter into ἐνέργεια until the second coming of Christ (ch. xiii. 14), so that the first age of the world still continues outwardly and that consequently our time is only a transition-period; with respect to the ethical sense of these ideas we have here the point of contact between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the views of Paul.—John's ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν must be understood as lying within the limits of these views. The use of ὥρα instead of ἡμέρα, the day which with God is equal to a thousand years (Ps. xc. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 8), indicates a peculiar feature, and the absence of the Article leaves it undefined. We have to think of a period of time belonging to the last days or last times which exhibits their character in a concentrated form, and since the ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα in the Gospel adverts particularly to the κρίσις, the reference seems to be to peculiarly *critical* manifestations. If now we have to translate: "*it is the last hour*," the reference to the antichrist and the antichrists is in admirable keeping with the announcements of the coming of false prophets and teachers for the purpose of temptation and trial, so that in them there already takes place a separation of true believers from false believers. Cf. Matth. xxiv. 24 sqq.; 1 Tim. iv. 1 sqq.; 2 Tim. iii. 1 sqq.—Hence ὥρα is neither=the season of the year, the wintry season of the world (Scholiast II), nor ἐσχάτη=χειρίστη (Oecumen., Schöttgen: *tempora periculosa, pessima et abjectissima*, Carpzov and others), which is also forbidden by 2 Tim. iii. 1. Bengel's explanation that it denotes the last hour of John's old age (*ultima, non respectu omnium mundi temporum, sed in antitheto puerulorum, ad patres et juvenes*), is a singular make-shift in order to guard John from the error that his prediction of the last hour had not been fulfilled. Nor can ἐσχάτη ὥρα designate the time immediately preceding *the destruction of Jerusalem* (Socinus, Grotius), for the last time is not to be taken with such chronological precision. Nor is there any warrant for the assertion of Huther, that John wrote with a *presentiment* of the second coming of Christ (an assertion based on what is said v. 8 of the σκοτία and v. 17 of the κόσμος, that they παράγεται which simply marks the transitory character inhering in the σκοτία and the κόσμος), since he writes only under the impression and with a sense of the transitoriness of the powers of this first age of the world, and that he indi-

cates thereby the nearness of Christ's second coming (Lücke, Neander, Baumgarten-Crusius, Gerlach, Ebrard, Huther). Hence we may say with Düsterdieck that "John did not wish to supply a *chronological* but only a *real* definition" [that is, one relating simply to the object—M.], which is clearly indicated by ἐὰν φανερώθῃ (v. 28), since ὅταν is hardly the true reading there. "The prophetical substance of the Apostolical declaration is true," "the extension of the time from the *real* beginning (the destruction of Jerusalem, which does not disconcert John, and of the import of which, with reference to the history and the judgment of the world, his mind is fully made up), to the actual end of beings" denotes rather no measure at all than one that is too short. The first Messianic transition-period inaugurated by the Saviour in the form of a servant, governed by Him and terminating the first age of the world is the ἐσχάτη, during which men pass through peculiar troubles, perils and conflicts on to the promised advent of the second world-age of glory. In this transition-period there are however peculiar hours of development, one of which had come when John wrote his Epistle. The term ἐσχάτη ὥρα has therefore to be taken in a prophetical and eschatological sense; it has moreover an important bearing on *the history of Christ's kingdom* and constitutes a *historical* reference to the *second coming* of Christ as the commencement of the second world-age, but not a *chronological* reference to the *time when* the second coming is to take place.—Noteworthy is Calvin's explanation: *ultimum tempus, in quo sic complentur omnia, ut nihil supersit præter ultimam Christi revelationem*, and with reference to the absence of the Article also that of Besser: the time before a special revelation of the judicatory glory of Christ prefiguring *the* last hour before the universal final judgment.—

The Antichrist and the Antichrists. v. 18.

1. The word ἀντίχριστος occurs only here, v. 22; iv. 8 and 2 Jno. 7. and its meaning has to be ascertained first philologically and then exegetically.

2. ἀντὶ may mean both hostility and substitution. In the former case it denotes the antagonist of Christ, the *anti*christ, in the latter the *pretender*-Christ or *pseudo*-Christ. Thus ἀντίτυπος is a τύπος set in opposition to another τύπος, and ἀντίλυτρον a λύτρον, paid or given for something; so ἀντίθεος in Homer, denotes *godlike*, but other authors use it in the sense of *adverse to the gods; one and the same* word may then be used in *both* senses; but no word can have both meanings in one and the same place; hence we must not endeavour to combine the ideas of *anti*-Christ and *pretender*-Christ as Huther maintains ("the enemy of Christ, who, under the lying appearance of being the true Christ, endeavours to destroy the work of Christ"), although it must be conceded that the enemy of Christ appears at the same time with the pretension of being able to supply His place, of becoming His substitute, and that the pretender-Christ does occupy His place in hostility to Him. But the ἀντίχριστοι manifestly cannot be taken in this double sense. And still less allowable is it with Sander first to attach to the word in the Singular the sense of pseudo-Christ and mimic of Christ, and then immediately afterwards to make the Plural designate the enemies of Christ. We cannot get on purely philological considerations beyond the possibility of taking the word in one or the other of said senses.

3. We have to hold fast the fact that the word denotes *persons*. This is required of the Plural ἀντίχριστοι in v. 19: ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθαν, οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενήκεισαν μεθ' ἡμῶν. But if the ἀντίχριστοι are persons, then ἀντίχριστος must also be a person, for this is required by ἔρχεται. Hence *Bengel's* exposition is incorrect: "*Sive id vocabulum phrasis apostolica, sive sermo fidelium introduxit, Johannes errores, qui oriri possent, prævisurus, non modo* antichristum, *sed etiam* antichristos *vult dici; et ubi* antichristum vel spiritum antichristi vel deceptorem et antichristum *dicit, sub singulari numero omnes* mendaces *et veritatis inimicos innuit. Quemadmodumque* Christus *interdum pro* christianismo (where?), *sic* antichristus *pro* antichristianismo *sive doctrina et multitudine hominum Christo contraria dicitur. Antichristum jam tum venire, ita assentitur Johannes, ut non unum, sed multos, id quod amplius quiddam et tristius esse censet, antichristos factos esse doceat. Sæpe totum genus eorum, qui bonam aliquam aut malem indolem habent, singulari numero cum articulo exprimitur* (Matth. xii. 35; xviii. 17. 29.). *Igitur* antichristus SIVE antichristianismus *ab extrema Johannis ætate* (see above: the last hour=old age!) *per omnem seculorum tractum se propagavit et permanet, donec magnus ille adversarius exoritur.* This view is adopted by Lange, Baumgarten-Crusius, Besser and others.

4. We have here before us a law of historical development, a fixed ordinance of the history of the kingdom. The point in question is the ἐσχάτη ὥρα and the marks by which it may be known; the reference is to ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται and to ἀντίχριστοι γεγόνασιν, to that which has happened νῦν, to that which is still to be looked for and has been announced (ἠκούσατε):

And as ye have heard (through the announcement of the Apostles) **that an antichrist cometh, even now have there come into existence many antichrists** (καὶ νῦν—γεγόνασι).—It is by no means allowable to insert *ita est* before καθὼς ἠκούσατε (Bengel): nor must the Present ἔρχεται be put on a line with γεγόνασι, so that the antichrist now cometh and is present even as the others also have appeared; nor must ἔρχεται and γεγόνασι, made equal in point of time, be only so distinguished from each other that the former comes *aliunde*, while these have come *ex nobis*. Γεγόνασι, they are become, they have come into existence, denotes the antichrists as a historical product, on whom the surrounding powers operating in time have operated. Hence it is not equal to *coeperunt esse* (Erasmus) but to "they are become, they are existing."—Ebrard incorrectly renders ἔρχεται=*is future*, although he correctly explains it by=*will some day appear.* The Future is implied in the idea of coming and the Present indicates the certainty of the event. [Huther: The Present ἔρχεται instead of the Future; it denotes the future as an event which is sure to occur.—M.]. Accordingly the ἀντίχριστοι exist before the ἀντίχριστος, who however is sure to follow them, and that which appears in the former, the προδρόμοις, only in an isolated,

undeveloped and feeble form, is gathered together by the latter in his individual person, and developed in a powerful form. In the course of time malice will so surely become intensified and opposition to God and Christ will reach such a degree of development that the existence of many antichrists warrants the certain result of a future concentration and formation of this spirit in one person.

5. The ἀντίχριστοι come out of the Christian Church, they have themselves been Christians before (ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθαν v. 19); the antichrist, in like manner, will of course come forth from the ranks of the Christians, he will also be a man. Hence ἀντίχριστος is not Satan himself (Pseudohippolytos, Theodoret); the idea of Satan becoming man is inexecutable, since the Eternal Word only, the Image of the Father, in which man has been created, can become man.

6. The antichrists deny that Jesus is the Christ (v. 22; iv. 3; 2 Jno. 7);) that He did not come in the flesh, that He is not the Son of God, that He is not of God (ch. iv. 14 sqq.; v. 5 sqq.; v. 20 sq.). The doctrine is the denial of the truth, the *lie*, they themselves are LIARS, and according to John viii. 44, the children of the devil, of the father of the lie (ch. iii. 8–10). The Greeks strikingly observe: ὁ ψεύστης, ἐναντίος ὢν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἤτοι τῷ Χριστῷ, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν (Theophylact) and ὁ ψεύστης τὸ τοῦ διαβόλου ὄνομα (Scholiast II.). The antichrist and the antichrists are to be taken "as expressly connected with Satan" (Düsterdieck), and the two words here denote not substitution, but hostility to Christ exhibited in the form of eminent strength; the antichrist is pre-eminently the instrument and tool of Satan. Hence we have to exclude the exposition of Irenæus, Hippolytus, Cyrillus and others, that the antichrist was *tentans semet ipsum Christum ostendere*, and mimicking Christ.

7. The comparison of this passage with 2 Thess. ii. 1 sq. (Hofmann, *Heilige Schrift* I., p. 807 sqq.) requires this explanation. The name ἀντίχριστος used by John corresponds with the description given by Paul, ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, to denote his hostility with reference to his pretended ability to supply the place of God (ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσαι, ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐστὶν θεός). John contrasts the πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου with the πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, while Paul calls him ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὁ ἄνομος, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας. His appearing also is preceded by an ἀποστασία, and he himself is the precursor of the παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, just as in John. But we must not overlook a difference belonging to this agreement. John speaks in a more general way, and uses less definite terms than Paul, who gives more distinct prominence to the person and approach of the dreaded and dreadful one; but he also refers to τὸ κατέχον and ὁ κατέχων as a power wielded by a living person, and specifies that for the benefit of the Church his progress will be arrested and his appearing delayed, thus pointing, like John, to a historical development. —Remembering all these particulars, we have, *first* of all, to reject those expositions which limit the application of the subject to a solitary historical fact or a single personage, and regard this statement of the Apostle in the light of a prophecy of a church-historical fact. Thus the Greek expositors, and many others (Augustine, Luther, Calvin, al.) after them apply it to heretics or heresiarchs, e. g., to Simon Magus, Cerinthus, Ebion, the Gnostics, to Basilides, Valentinus, and others, the Nicolaitanes (Rev. ii. 6), to Diotrephes (3 John 9.), Hymeneus and Philetus (2 Tim. ii. 17), and Grotius actually applies it to Barcochba, Calov to Mohammed, Luther (*Art. Schm. tract. de pot. et prim. papæ*, § 39; cf. Melanchthon, *Apol. Art.* VII. VIII., § 23; XV. § 18) to the pope, and Roman Catholics to Luther. All this is purely arbitrary and unwarranted, and not only depreciates the word of prophecy, but actually deprives it of the prophetical element, as if it had ceased to be valid. *Secondly*, we have also to reject the modern exposition (both that of rationalistic commentators and that of Lücke, de Wette and Neander) which insists upon separating the *idea*, "that simultaneously with the development of Christianity, *evil* also would gradually increase in intensity, until having reached its culmination, it would be completely conquered by the power of Christ," from the *form* as here indicated, and that the form, as the mere shell, might be dropped. On the contrary, both the *idea* and the *form* have to be held fast, for we have here the expression of a law ever recurring in historical manifestations which belongs to the development of the history of the Kingdom [of God] up to and until the end of the time of Messiah and the Church, and this expression is so clearly and distinctly asserted that John feels warranted to draw the emphatic conclusion: "**whence we know that there is a last hour.**" By the appearing of many antichrists we may know and infer thence (ὅθεν) as from a distinct premise, that there is an onward progress in the direction of Christ's coming, which is preceded by the concentration of the antichristian element, thriving and luxuriating of course in different persons according to its different forms of manifestation. [On the different views of the antichrist see Lünemann on 2 Thess. ii. 1–12; p. 204 sqq., and Düsterdieck *ad locum;* also Trench, *Synonyms of the N. T.*, p. 145 sqq.—M.].

Relation of the Antichrists to the Church. First there is noted the fact that,

VER. 19. **From us they went out.**—The most natural and primary meaning of ἡμῶν is that it designates the Apostle and his readers, consequently the Church, which is addressed by παιδία, and to be understood in ἠκούσατε. The reference is neither to the Jews (Grotius, Rickli), nor to the Apostles only (Spener, Besser), nor only to the Church with exclusion of the children (Ebrard). Apart from the *form* ἐξῆλθαν, which in this very verb is by no means uncommon in the New Testament (Winer, pp. 86, 87), the sense is various: *prodire, exire, egredi, secedere.* Two ideas play into each other: origin and separation, coming out and going away. The nature of the ἀντίχριστοι who are engaged in the ἀποστασία, not μεμενήκεισαν μεθ' ἡμῶν, requires us to translate *secesserunt, evaserunt* (Augustine, Bede, Erasmus, Lücke, Düsterdieck, Ebrard, Huther). *Prodierunt* (Vulgate, al.) misapprehends the origin of the antichrists, and denotes origin only. ἐξῆλθαν does not point to their development and origin,

but only to their separation, their apostasy, which ἐξ ἡμῶν requires us to regard as their apostasy from the Church; γεγόνασιν, to be sure, shows that they are within that Church from which they have now separated. This is brought out "by the emphatic position of ἐξ ἡμῶν before the verb" (Huther), for ἐξ ἡμῶν in connection with the verb ἐξέρχεσθαι merely denotes the circle, the fellowship from which they have separated. "John does not indicate the extent to which that formal separation has been carried; still ἐξῆλθαν implies that they had not only opposed the Apostolical doctrine (Beza: "*ad mutationem non loci, sed doctrinæ pertinet*"), but also those who, by the faithful preservation of the unadulterated Gospel, had proved themselves to be children of God" (Huther).

But they were not of us.—Εἶναι ἐξ ἡμῶν indicates the internal relation. Here the idea of origin combines with that of appertaining and affinity. 'Αλλὰ (Winer, pp. 462, 472, ἀλλα) denotes the strong opposition of ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθαν and ἐξ ἡμῶν ἦσαν. While the former simply betokens external origin and coming out from, the latter indicates internal relationship; they were the former, not the latter; the aforesaid fact expressly denies this internal relation. Both origin (coming from) and relationship (affinity, appertaining to) are contained in εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (v. 16) and in ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (Jno. viii. 42; xvi. 28; while ἀπὸ θεοῦ, Jno. xiii. 3, and παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, xvi. 27, denote only the former.) [Augustine: *Quandoquidem adhuc curatur corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et sanitas perfecta non erit nisi in resurrectione mortuorum; sic sunt in corpore Christi, quomodo humores mali. Quando evomuntur, tunc revelatur corpus: sic et mali quando exeunt, tunc revelatur ecclesia. Et dicit quando eos evomit atque projicit corpus, ex me exierunt humores isti, sed non erant ex me. Quid est, non erant ex me? Non de carne mea præcisi sunt, sed pectus mihi premebant dum inessent.*"—M.]. But John here sharply contrasts the two and excludes the one by the other, adding moreover,

For if they had been of us, they would have abode with us.—Consequently, they had been μεθ' ἡμῶν, they had belonged to the Christians, they had lived among and with the Christians, they were Christians outwardly and to be considered as such. Although they had been μεθ' ἡμῶν, they were not ἐξ ἡμῶν, for in that case they would have abode μεθ' ἡμῶν. On the very frequent omission of the augment in the Pluperfect see Winer, p. 85. On the dogmatical and ethical import of this passage, see below in *Doctrinal and Ethical*, especially sub. Nos. 4. 5.

But—that they might be made manifest, that not all are of us.—Here is an imperfect and involved construction. After ἀλλὰ we have of course to supply the thought suggested by the previous words: but they did not abide with us, that—(Huther, Winer, *Grammar* p. 333. where may be found the corresponding illustrations Jno. xiii. 18: ἐξελεξάμην, ἀλλ' (ἐξελεξάμην) ἵνα;—Jno. xv. 25: μεμισήκασιν—, ἀλλ' (μεμισήκασιν) ἵνα—). In general γέγονε τοῦτο would have to be supplied, which would however depend on the context for its meaning, as in Jno. i. 8: ἀλλ' (ἦλθεν) ἵνα—; ix. 3: ἀλλ' (but he was born blind) ἵνα—. But de Wette has very correctly pointed out that *two* sentences are here interlaced, and Huther has rightly arranged them thus: 1, ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐξ ἡμῶν, 2, ἵνα φανερωθῇ ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν. The secession of the antichrists has taken place and constitutes an event that does not take place without some providential design, an event in which God the Lord takes an active part both as Ruler and Judge, hence ἵνα, *to the end that, in order that.* The Apostle's design is to mark a *purpose* and not a *consequence*, as Lange and Paulus maintain without any reason for their view. The purpose is *first*, that they shall manifest themselves as those who do not sustain to us an inward and ethical relation of kinship and appertainment, and *secondly*, that it shall become manifest in general that not all those who are in the Church and outwardly belong to it (μεθ' ἡμῶν, *in ecclesia*) do also belong to it inwardly (ἐξ ἡμῶν, *de ecclesia*). We have to connect οὐ πάντες in the sense of *nonnulli;* for if we were to connect οὐκ εἰσὶν so that the negation would belong to the predicate, John would have written οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐξ ἡμῶν πάντες, and we should be obliged to explain. "*All* are not of us," or "*none* is of us." In this case there would be something predicated of the antichrists, they would be the subject in πάντες. But this is not allowable on account of the position of the words. The meaning is rather: "Not all are of us, only some, although the majority are of us." But this cannot be predicated of the antichrists; for they are not all true, living church-members, none of them belongs truly to the Church. But their seceding furnishes actual proof that not all Christians (*baptizati, vocati*) are and remain real Christians (*electi, fideles*). "While in φανερωθῶσιν the seceders only are considered as the subject, the conception is enlarged in the clause ὅτι—ἡμῶν, and the Apostle declares in respect of the former, that in general *not all* who belong outwardly to the Christian Church, *are* really members of the same (Düsterdieck). It is not allowable to understand οὐ πάντες with Socinus in the sense of *nulli:* the connection is right, the explanation is wrong. [Wordsworth: "They *all* pretend to be of us, and the heathen confound them with us. But their secession *from* us, and opposition to us, clearly *prove* that they are not all of us. *Some* false teachers [or false brethren M.] there are still who propagate heresies *in* the Church. They are tares in the field, but as long as they are *in* the field, it is not easy to distinguish them from the wheat. They are not of us, but they are *not manifested* as such by going out from us. But the *going out* of those who *have* left us, and who resist us, is a *manifest* token to all men, that they and their associates are not *all of us*, as they profess to be, and as the heathen suppose them to be; and as even some of the brethren in the Church imagine that they are, and are therefore deceived by them. By their going out they are manifested in their true light; and by their opposition to us Truth is distinguished from Error and Error from Truth." —M.].

Testimony of the gifts of believers. vv. 20. 21.

VER. 20. **And you have ointment from the Holy One and know all things.**—The address ὑμεῖς has regard to the readers, to the Church, from which the antichrists have seceded. They are referred to a gift: ἔχετε.

This gift is χρῖσμα, *unguentum*, not *unctio* as explained by Vulgate, Augustine, Luther, de Wette, Sander, al. It is chrism. "*Alludit appellatio* CHRISMATIS ad ANTICHRISTI nomen" (Bengel). [They have the *chrism* from *Christ.*—M.]. Thus John came to use this word which besides this place occurs only in v. 27. In obedience to the command of God kings (1 Sam. x. 10; xvi. 13, 14; Ps. xlv. 8), priests (Ex. xxix. 7; xxx. 31) and prophets (Is. lxi. 1) were anointed, and ointment is both figuratively, and in the ordered act itself, a symbol of the Holy Spirit. Thus Christ is anointed (Acts iv. 27) and that with the Holy Spirit (Acts x. 38), and thus Christians also are anointed. The chrism or ointment will have to be understood as the Holy Spirit and ὑμεῖς ἔχετε χρῖσμα reminds the readers of the great gift which makes them priests, kings and prophets, the γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, 1 Pet. ii. 9; cf. Ex. xix. 6; Is. xliii. 20. 21. This gift of the Holy Spirit must not be made the "*divinum beneficium cognoscendi ipsas res divinas, quatenus homini est opus*" (Socinus), or the "*auditio evangelii, institutio christiana*" (Episcopius, Rosenmüller), or the "*docendi auctoritas*" (Sauler), or "the true tradition concerning Christ distinguished by its being primitive, originating with the Apostles and vitally propagated" (Köstlin, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 243), or the "*caritas quæ diffunditur in cordibus nostris per spiritum sanctum*" (Didymus). And this having is a gift ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου, they have received what they have; hence v. 27: τὸ χρῖσμα—ἐλάβετε. Christ is called ἁγνός ch. iii. 3 and δίκαιος ch. ii. 2; in Jno. vi. 69 He is called: ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, Acts iii. 14: ὁ ἅγιος καὶ δίκαιος, Rev. iii. 7: ὁ ἅγιος ὁ ἀληθινός. The primary reference therefore seems to be to Christ who received the Spirit without measure (Jno. iii. 34), and baptized with the Holy Ghost (Jno. i. 33) and sends Him from the Father (Jno. xv. 26; Acts ii. 33) and hence the idea is that the Χριστός makes the χριστούς.—Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου consequently denotes neither God the Father (Socinus, Episcopius, Rickli, Neander, Besser, al.) nor the Holy Ghost (Didymus, Grotius).—It must be remembered that nothing is said here of the time when they received this gift nor of the means by which it was conveyed to them, but we read simply: ἔχετε. Hence there is no warrant for finding here an allusion to baptism (Augustine, Bede, Oecumenius), and the inference of the ungenuineness of the Epistle from the supposition of an allusion to a usage connected with baptism introduced at a later period, is wholly unjustifiable (Baur). [The argument *for* an allusion to baptism, rests on the hypothesis that this whole section is addressed to π α ι δ ί α, *pueruli*, *children*, who received the gifts of the Holy Spirit in their baptism; it is then by implication extended to adults, and the use of chrism in baptism, a practice which does not belong to the Apostolical Age, seems to have been occasioned by this passage. Bengel: "*Eam unctionem spiritualem habent* τὰ παιδία, *pueruli: namque cum baptismo, quem susceperunt, confunctum erat donum Spiritus Sancti, cujus significandi causa ex hoc loco deinceps usu receptum esse videtur, ut oleo corpora baptizatorum ungerentur.*"—M.]. It is more allowable to connect with v. 24 cf. v. 18, and to refer to the *preaching of the word of God* (Düsterdieck). We read simply "*ye have—!* Thus John reminds his readers of an important and responsible gift from which they might derive comfort and enjoyment in opposition to the antichrists, but which they ought also to keep, use and show against these adversaries. Hence the thought is introduced by καί, as John is wont to do, without indicating an antithesis which is contained in the matter itself; his object being to develop his argument by way of comfort and exhortation. [It is doubtful whether there is even an adversative implication in the *thought*, for John surely did not want to inform his readers that because they had the χρῖσμα they were the opposite of the antichrists. I do not mean that ὑμεῖς is not antithetical, but doubt whether καί is intended to mark an emphatic antithesis; in which case the Apostle would most probably have used δὲ or dispensed with the particle altogether. So Huther.—M.]. There is no reason at all to discover here with Semler a "*captatio benevolentiæ*," or with a Lapide an apology for the shortness of the Epistle; and still more objectionable is the view of Lange that "a certain anxious care is unmistakable which puts forth even rhetorical efforts;" nor is Calvin right in saying: "*modeste excusat apostolus, quod eos tam sollicite admonet, ne putent oblique se perstringi, quasi rudes ignarosque eorum, quæ probe tenere debuerant.*" The further particular

And know all things denotes the immediate gain they derive from this gift. Bengel rightly explains "*et inde.*" Πάντα is evidently neuter. The Syriac translates therefore falsely "*omnes.*" Although Calvin rightly says of πάντα: "*omnia non universaliter capi, sed ad præsentis loci circumstantiam restringi debet,*" we must not restrict it with Bengel to "*ea, quæ vos scire opus est: hoc responso repellendi erant seductores.*" Still less must it be applied with Estius to the Church, as knowing all things, whereas individual Christians know only *implicite* if they hold to the Church [He says: "*Habetis episcopos et presbyteros, quorum cura ac studio vestræ ecclesiæ satis instructæ sunt in iis quæ pertinent ad doctrinæ christianæ veritatem.*"—M.]. The reference, according to v. 21 and agreeably to Jno. xvi. 13: τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ cf. ch. xiv. 26) is rather to πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν (so Huther and most expositors). The sentence οἴδατε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, v. 21 is wholly=οἴδατε τὰ πάντα.

VER. 21. **I have not written unto you, because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it.**—Ἔγραψα refers to the words immediately preceding v. 19 [that is to what the Apostle had just said concerning the antichrists—M.], and not to the Gospel, as Ebrard arbitrarily asserts. Not ignorance or want of knowledge on the part of the Church induced the Apostle to write this Epistle, on the contrary it was their knowledge and ability to form a right judgment of what was transpiring among them which prompted him to indite this Epistle, anxious as he was to foster and stimulate the truth possessed by his Church. Lorinus: "*non ut vos hæc doceam, sed ut doctos confirmem.*"—Ἀλήθεια is "the truth as announced by the Apostles, determining the whole walk in the light of believers (ch. i. 8; ii. 4), begetting all love, giving life and founded on Christ (v. 28 sqq.).

Whatsoever falls within the compass of this truth is the object of Christian knowledge, all this is known by believers" (Düsterdieck).

And that every thing which is lie is not of the truth.—Καὶ ὅτι is not connected with ἔγραψα: ·*and because*—as if indicating the motive which prompted the Apostle to write this Epistle, but the sentence depended on the second οἴδατε and is an object-sentence coördinated with αὐτήν: ye know it (the truth)—*and that*—. Thus render almost all commentators. Hence springs the question (v. 22) τίς ἐστιν ὁ ψεύστης; John assumes that they know who is the liar, as well as what and whence the lie is. Here εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας denotes not only origin but also appurtenance conditioned and defined by the origin. Of course πᾶν—οὐκ must not be explained here as a Hebraism (Grotius and al.)=οὐδέν, since οὐκ evidently belongs to the predicate, but=*every* lie is *not* out of the truth, which, however, amounts to=*no* lie is out of the truth. The reference to the antichrists is plain and the sense manifest: every thing which is lie neither originates from the truth, nor can it remain with the truth; it is not matter of complaint or of surprise that the antichrists with their lies and denials are seceding. Ψεῦδος consequently is not only *error*, but the distinct opposite of the truth, nor is it the abstract put for the concrete, viz.: the false teachers (Lange). Our Lord Himself tells us whence the lie originates, it is from the devil (Jno. viii. 44). The truth is *from* God and full of God, and therefore incompatible with any and every lie. [Diversity of origin renders the truth and the lie incompatibles. Christ is the truth (Jno. xiv. 6). Lorinus: "*Lex vero non nisi verum sequitur et verum vero consonat.*"—M.]. All knowledge and ability to form a right judgment of moral phenomena are founded on the χρῖσμα, the Holy Spirit, consequently on a gift, even the gift which begins with sanctifying the will and renewing the heart. Sanctification leads to illumination. This points to the powerful exhortation which accompanies the consolation.

The substance of the antichristian lie. vv. 22. 23.

Ver. 22. **Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?**—The interrogative form marks the vivacity with which John passes from the general abstract (πᾶν ψεῦδος) to the definite concrete (ὁ ψεύστης) as in ch. v. 4. 5. [Huther.] There is here surely no reference to *children* (Ebrard). Hence Bengel rightly explains: *ὁ vim habet ad abstractum* v. 21=*quis est* plains: *ὁ vim habet ad abstractum* 21=*quis est illius mendacii reus?*" The Article is by all means to be retained (Luther translates wrongly: who is *a* liar? [also E. V.—M.]) and to be explained as bringing out with emphatic distinctness the idea "*the* liar κατ' ἐξοχήν *i. e.* he in whom the lie appears in concrete form=ὁ ἀντίχριστος" (Huther). It must not, however, be restricted to one individual besides whom there is none like him, but rather be taken generically or collectively with reference to the genus of antichristians, like ὁ νικῶν in ch. v. 5 (Düsterdieck); πᾶν ψεῦδος of course concentrates in him, if we exclude lies in other spheres, *e. g.* those of the natural sciences, history or jurisprudence; here we have to do with the sphere of religion, with church-life. All comparative explanations dilute the conception of the Apostle; under this head we may enumerate those of Calvin ("*nisi hoc censeatur mendacium, aliud nullum haberi posse*"), Socinus ("*mendacium quo nihil possit esse majus*"), Grotius ("*Quis potest esse major impostor?*"), Episcopius ("*enormitas mendacii*"), J. Lange ("*mendax præcipuus et periculosior?*"), de Wette ("who deserves more the name of liar?").—Huther very justly says that Baumgarten-Crusius has altogether missed the Apostle's meaning in his explanation: "What is an erroneous doctrine, if not etc."—In the sentence εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνούμενος, the term εἰ μὴ is=*nisi*, except; εἰ οὐ, *si non* would be inapplicable (Winer, p. 499) cf. ch. v. 5; Luke xvii. 18; Rom. xi. 15, etc. The negative οὐκ in the sentence: ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστὸς might have been omitted, since it is preceded by ἀρνούμενος; but the affirmation of the liar is fully indicated, although it is couched in the form of a negation; this is in perfect agreement with the genius of the Greek language. Similar terms are found Luke xx. 27; Gal. v. 17; Heb. xii. 19; cf. Kühner, II. p. 410; Winer, p. 582 β. The essential feature and the height of the lie of the antichrist is this: Jesus is not the Christ, the Saviour promised by and come from the Father, the λόγος σὰρξ γενόμενος; this is the gnostic error which does not distinguish Jesus from Christ, but tears them asunder and thus constitutes the strongest antithesis to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The reference therefore is neither to the form of Jewish unbelief that Jesus is not *omnium hominum patronus* (Semler) nor to the two forms of heresy one of which denies that Jesus was the Eternal *Word*, and the other that the *Eternal Word* became flesh (Besser following Tertullian), [who says: *de Præscript.* c. 33: *Joh. in ep. eos maxime antichristos vocat, qui Christum negarent in carne venisse et qui non putarent Jesum esse Filium Dei; illud Marcion, hoc Ebion vindicavit.*"—Wordsworth, following Irenæus and Waterland, refers also to Cerinthus and his followers, who denied that *Jesus* was the *Christ*, dividing *Jesus* from *Christ;* and they denied *the Son*, because they did not acknowledge that *Jesus* was personally united with the *Word*, the Eternal Son of God; nor that the Word was the only begotten of the Father; and so they disowned the divine Sonship of Jesus and Christ; and thus they denied the *Father* and the *Son.*"—M.]. The reference is only to *one* lie.

This is the antichrist who denieth the Father and the Son.—Ὁ ἀντίχριστος here and ὁ ψεύστης in the preceding clause, are evidently identical, and for the very reason that the liar denies Christ [or as Huther puts it: the liar, who denies the identity of Jesus and Christ, is the antichrist.—M.]. John adds "a new particular, exhibiting the wholly fatal consequence of that antichristian lie," (Düsterdieck) to this name in the following clause: ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν; here, to use the terse language of Luther, John knocks the bottom out of the barrel.—The antichrist denies also the Father. First he denies *Christ* and then proceeds to deny that He is the Son of and with the Father until he reaches the extreme position of denying the *Father* Himself. The Χρίστος belongs to history, to the economy of salvation. The idea υἱός reaches further, even down to the innermost Being of God; the

denial of the Son violates the very Being of God, consequently the Father and thus far must it come with one who denies Christ. In *Jesus* appeared as *Christ*, as the Saviour of the world, the *Son* of the Father full of grace and truth, the Eternal Word which is from the beginning, and in the Son is manifested the Being of the Father, His Spirit and His Love, so that the knowledge of the Father is impossible without the knowledge of the Son. Hence he who denies Christ is led to the point that he has an ideal conception of God of his own making, an εἴδωλον, as Huther puts it, but not the true God. [Huther, to whom Braune is indebted for the thought, puts the logical sequence more lucidly than the latter; he says: He who denies the identity of Jesus and Christ, denies first the Son, for the Son is none other than Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός (neither an Aeon called Christ who did not become man, nor Jesus who is not Christ, or according to Jno. i. 14, who is not the Logos); but whoso denies the Son, denies also the Father not only in as far as Father and Son are logically convertible terms, but because the Being of the Father manifests Itself only in the Son and because all true knowledge of the Father is conditioned by the knowledge of the Son, so that the God of those who deny the Son is not the true God, but a false creation of their own thoughts—an εἴδωλον.—M.].

VER. 23. **Every one that denieth the Son, hath also not the Father** [*neither hath he the Father*].—Here is the progression from *denying* (ἀρνεῖσθαι) to *having* (ἔχειν), and from the particular (ὁ ψεύστης) to the general (πᾶς).—Ἀρνούμενος evidently cannot be without an object, so that we have to connect πᾶς ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν υἱὸν, but not: every one that denieth hath not the Son also (hath not) the Father; neither ὁ ἀρνούμενος nor the immediately succeeding ὁ ὁμολογῶν can be independent subjects, and πατέρα joined to υἱὸν cannot be governed by ἔχειν as in 2 Jno. 9.—Ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν υἱὸν signifies to disown the Eternal Word of the Father, the Logos (not only in Jesus who without the Logos is not and cannot be the Christ, but *absolutely*), and as such disowning implies not only mere ignorance or a limited understanding, but also infirmity and impurity of the heart and the will, it points to a separation of man from the Son of God, so that it becomes an οὐκ ἔχειν, and contains and operates an οὐκ ἔχειν 2 Jno. 9. It is therefore "*habere in agnitione et communione* (Bengel), a possession in vital fellowship (Düsterdieck); "*habere in mente et fide, in ore et confessione*" (a Lapide), "in faith and in love" (de Wette), "in knowledge, faith and confession" (Lücke). False are the expositions of Socinus ("*non habere opinionem, quod Deus sit*"), Grotius ("*non cognoscere Deum seu quæ sit ejus voluntas erga humanum genus*"), Episcopius and others.—Οὐδὲ emphatically denotes the further loss that one cannot separate oneself from the Son without giving up the Father. The Apostle now concludes affirmatively:

He that confesseth the Son hath the Father also.—On ὁμολογεῖν see above on ch. ii. 9. It is an act of the inner life and of a more intimate fellowship. Cf. Matth. x. 32; Rom. x. 10. [Düsterdieck: "In the denial of the Son is involved necessarily the denial of the Father, since the Father cannot be known without the Son, and the Father cannot be received, believed on, loved, by any man, without the Son, or otherwise than through the Son, *i. e.* the Son manifested in the flesh, the Christ, which is Jesus. So that in John's development of the argument there are three essentially connected points: denial of the Christ, of the Son, of the Father. The middle link of the chain, the denial of the Son of God, shows how the denial of the Father is of necessity involved in the denial of Christ. And the cogency of this proof is made yet more stringent by another equally unavoidable process of argument. The antichristian false doctrine consists mainly in a negation, in the denial of the fundamental truth, that Jesus is the Christ. But in this is involved the denial of the Essence of the Son as well as of the Father, and again in this denial is involved the losing, the virtual *not having* of the Son and of the Father. In the sense of John, we may say, taking the first and last steps of his argument and leaving out the intervening ones: *He who denieth that Jesus is the Christ, hath not the Father.* And this necessary connection between denying and not having is perfectly clear, the moment we understand the ethical character, the living realism of John's way of regarding the subject. As (v. 23) we cannot separate the knowledge and confession of the Christ, the Son, the Father, from the *having*, the real possession of, the practical fellowship with, the actual remaining in the Son and the Father, so conversely, together with the denial is necessarily given the *not having*: together with the loss of the truth of the knowledge, the loss of the life which consists in that knowledge (Jno. xvii. 3). In such a connection, the *confession* of the truth is as essential on the one side, as the *denial* on the other. Each is the necessary manifestation of the belief or unbelief hidden in the heart. And this ὁμολογεῖν is not to be understood of the "*confessio cordis, vocis et operis*," (Bede), but only as ch. i. 9, of the confession of the mouth (στόματι ὁμολογεῖται, Rom. x. 9, see Jno. xii. 42). It is parallel with φέρειν διδαχὴν, 2 Jno. 7. 10; and indicates the definite utterance of the doctrine which was made known by the Apostolic preaching, verse 24."—M.].

Paternal exhortation founded on promises, vv. 24. 25.

VER. 24. **Ye, let that which ye have heard from the beginning, abide in you.**—The sentence is anacoluthic. It is well explained by Theophylact: ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν οὕτως ὑμεῖς δὲ ἅπερ ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς—φυλάττετε παρ ἑαυτοῖς.—ὑμεῖς therefore must not be connected with ἠκούσατε, as if it were a mere transposition; there would be no reason whatsoever for such a connection and no reason or necessity for such an emphasis. So in v. 27, and frequently. See Winer §. §. 28, 3; 64, 2. d. Kühner II, 156. Hence the explanations of Bengel ("*antitheton est in pronomine*; *ideo adhibetur trajectio*"), de Wette ("ὑμεῖς is really the subject of the relative sentence, placed before"), and others are erroneous. Neither can ὑμεῖς be the pure Vocative (Ebrard, Paulus), nor be taken as an absolute Nominative (Myrberg).—The spurious οὖν after ὑμεῖς is not improper *per se* (Düsterdieck in opposition to de Wette with whom Huther agrees), for it is not an antithesis of what goes before, which is also assumed by Theophylact, because the preceding sentence closes af-

firmatively thus: ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει; and this is the ground of the present exhortation.—On ὃ ἠκούσατε cf. v. 7. John points to the apostolical announcement. Ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is more clearly defined by it (*ex quo instituti cœpistis in primis christianæ religionis rudimentis*, Beza, so also Lücke and others). There is no necessity to think of the *prima ecclesiæ nascentis tempora* (Bede). The substance of ὃ, not ἃ, seems to be simple. But it is not enough to understand in general *evangelium Christi* (Calvin), or the truth that Jesus is the Christ (Huther, Lücke), or θεολογούμενον τὸν χριστὸν (Theophylact), but we had better understand with Bengel (*de patre et filio*) the theologoumenon of the Father and the Son besides that fundamental truth (Düsterdieck), as indicated in the preceding verses.—Ἐν ὑμῖν μενέτω. describes ἔχειν as a possession that has to be kept. The preposition must preserve its proper meaning; that which has been heard must "be in dwelling within as something that determines the life" (Neander). This meaning is also urged by the parallel passage Jno. xv. 1–10, where μένειν appears as a favourite expression of our Lord. In the sentence immediately following it is indeed impossible to render ἐν, *with*. The same holds good here. Hence Theophylact's παρὰ and Luther's *with* are false. The truth and doctrine as announced by the Apostles "is really to dwell *in them*, as a living power in their hearts" (Düsterdieck), and if that takes place, ἐὰν ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ ὃ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἠκούσατε,

If in you—emphatically placed first—**abides that which ye have heard from the beginning, ye also shall abide in the Son and in the Father.**—Bengel well observes: καὶ: *vicissim*. Düsterdieck hits the mark: "John denotes by the position of καὶ before ὑμεῖς the promised consequence which will correspond with the indicated destination while at the same time he makes prominent the fine turn contained in the thoughtful change of ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ and ὑμεῖς ἐν τῷ υἱῷ μενεῖτε." The reciprocal effect of the Word abiding in you and of the Church abiding in Christ does not refer to the origin of the relation of the Church and of her conduct, but only to the further development of the same. But the expression and its order intimate that the word must first be brought, preached and explained, and then be heard, received and kept, and that it must have found in individual Christians an element in which it is vitally efficient, even as it is full of life, in order to enable them to have (ἔχειν) and to live in Christ as their element. ἐν τῷ υἱῷ stands naturally before καὶ τῷ πατρὶ because the Son is the Mediator of this life-fellowship. Hence Theophylact's exposition, based on Jno. xvii. 2. 21: κοινωνοὶ αὐτοῦ ἔσεσθε, goes hardly far enough. The life of believers must really and essentially be rooted in God, derive nourishment, grow and mature to completeness from Him. Faith has not only brought news and intelligence and become acquainted with God, but has entered into personal intercourse with Him and carries away from Him the separate gifts, benefits and powers. The possession of this life is not left to the distant future, although the life is an eternal life, but the object of Christian hope in respect of its perfection and at the same time something present and the object of present experience; to speak with Calvin: *deum se totum nobis in Christo fruendum* dedit, not *dabit* (Düsterdieck). Besides the principal passage Jno. xv. 1 sqq. the following places are very similar Jno. vi. 56; xvii. 23; Gal. ii. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 16; Eph. iii. 17. Hence the evaporating and diluting views of Grotius ("*conjunctissimi Patri et filio eritis, summo eorum favore et amicitia fruemini*") Semler ("*sitis certi, nobis patere omnem hanc felicitatem unice veram*") and others, as well as the scholastic, orthodox views of Schmid ("*gratiosa filii et Patris inhabitatio*") and J. Lange ("*unio cum deo mystica, communio cum eo jam inchoata, communicatio, per quam omnes regni divini dotes homini in usum sanctum et beatum contingunt*"), are insignificant to bring out the mind and the thoughts of John in their living fulness.

Ver. 25. **And this is the promise which He hath promised us, the life eternal.**—Αὕτη ἐστὶν should be explained here as in ch. ii. 28. v. 11. 14 where the same words occur in the same position or as in ch. i. 5: καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη; the reference is to the words which follow—τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον. The substance or object of ἐπαγγελία is qualified here by a Substantive, while the substance or object of ἀγγελία or ἐντολὴ or μαρτυρία or παῤῥησία in the other passages is indicated by a clause connected with ὅτι or ἵνα according to the context. Instead of the Accusative (ζωὴν), the Nominative (ζωὴ) ought to have been in apposition with ἐπαγγελία, but it was both attracted as apposition to the relative clause ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν annexed in the same case as ἣν. See Winer, p. 552 sq. Therefore *manere in filio et patre* is not the ἐπαγγελία and ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος not a pure apposition, so that the abiding itself is described as eternal life (Sander, Besser), but "the life eternal is the promise" (so Huther and most commentators). The ἐπαγγελία is *promissio*, consequently not *res promissa* (J. Lange, Estius), as if it were true contrary to the genius and usage of Greek to add ἣν—ἐπηγγείλατο. Αὐτὸς designates Him "who is the centre of this whole section" [Huther), that is Christ, and neither the Father (Hunnius), nor the Father through the Son (Socinus). But ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος, as the substance and object of the ἐπαγγελία of the Son, is not viewed as a gift remote from and subsequent to this promise, but as present and experienced, acquired and enjoyed wherever the pre-requisite of the promise is complied with, namely the abiding of the word in you. Where the promise applies, it is forthwith fulfilling itself. Therefore it is not said that we should acquire the life eternal, but that at which this promise is aimed is simply mentioned and connected by attraction with ἐπηγγείλατο.—Καὶ accordingly has here its ordinary force as copula, connecting this sentence with the one preceding, adding and explaining something implied, but not yet particularly mentioned in the preceding sentence; the reference is to something directly connected with abiding in God; καὶ therefore must not be taken αἰτιολογικῶς (Oecumenius) or as designating the further consequence of holding fast the Gospel (Lücke). Düsterdieck strikingly observes: "The present reality of eternal life in believers is no more annulled by the fact that it is not yet perfected in them than that inversely continued growth, a holy and fruitful development, and the

final glorious perfection are excluded by its real possession."

Conclusion, with repeated warnings and exhortations vv. 26–28.

VER. 26. **These things I have written unto you concerning those who deceive you.**—Here ταῦτα connected with ἔγραψα refers back to the preceding verses, and the object περὶ τῶν πλανώντων ὑμᾶς points back as far as v. 18. The πλανῶντες ὑμᾶς are the antichrists, and denotes that they are dangerous *per se*, really and not only unsuccessfully dangerous, as is evident from v. 19. [It is doubtful whether the reference to v. 19 warrants the inference of their actual success in the case of those whom the Apostle is addressing. The deceivers themselves had seceded; that is all we can gather from v. 19, and that they were anxious to deceive others we learn from this verse, but nothing is said of their having been successful in their endeavour.—M.]. This is also intimated by the Accusative ὑμᾶς and 2 Jno. 8; Matth. xxiv. 5, 11, 24. [This is certainly a singular conclusion, for ὑμᾶς indicates that they, the readers of the Epistle, the Church, are the object of the deceiver's endeavours.—M.]. The word itself denotes an act, a continuing activity, and therefore more than a "*studium, conatus*," "*seducere conantibus*" (Bengel, Huther). [See *Apparat. Critic.* v. 26, note 27.—M.]. Hence the reiterated exhortation to fidelity.

VER. 27. **And you—the ointment which ye received from Him, abideth in you, and ye have no need that any one teach you.**—Thought, expression and construction, as in vv. 20, 21: καὶ ὑμεῖς τὸ χρῖσμα—φυλάττετε=μένει ἐν ὑμῖν. From ὑμᾶς, v. 26, the Apostle takes καὶ ὑμεῖς, and contrasting them with οἱ πλανῶντες, places said words emphatically in anteposition, for they would be too strongly emphasized if we were to connect them with the relative clause. cf. v. 24. Τὸ χρῖσμα here, as χρῖσμα, v. 20, is in the Accusative, but must not be connected with the relative clause, *per trajectionem.* The Article denotes what is known and what has already been mentioned. 'Ελάβετε distinctly marks their reception and points to a greater obligation than the previous reference to possession (ἔχετε, v. 20). The gift is not without its task and work, here, under the impulse of gratitude. 'Απ' αὐτοῦ of course designates Him round whom the Apostle's thoughts revolve as round their centre, the same who is described in ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου, Christ, v. 20. This verse proves that τοῦ ἁγίου, v. 20, relates to Christ (Huther). While the Future was used in v. 24 (μενεῖτε), we have here the Present (μένει) in order to express the Apostle's certain assurance (Huther) and to exhort at the same time to that which he does expect. Bengel ("*Habet hic indicativus perquam subtilem adhortationem (conferendam ad* 2. Tim. iii. 14) *qua fideles, a deceptatoribus sollicitatos, ita iis respondere facit:* unctio in nobis manet: non egemus doctore: illa nos verum docet: in ea doctrina permanebimus. Vide *quam amœna sit transitio ab hac sermocinatione ad sermonem directum versu sequenti* "Manet in vobis: manebitis in Illo" *correlata*).—*Καί*, and because the Holy Spirit is and *abideth in you* (Bengel: *et ideo*), οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε, ye have no need whatever; thus is brought out here the αὐτάρκεια θεοδιδάκτων, and we have here a new particular, which was not expressed in v. 20. The construction with ἵνα occurs also Jno. ii. 25; xvi. 30.—Τοῦ διδάσκειν, Heb. v. 12. The Infinitive only, Matth. iii. 14; xiv. 6; 1 Thess. i. 8; iv. 9. This teaching is taken here not as a simple consequence, but as the end and aim because of the condition of the persons to be taught. Love prompts thereto, for love deems it its duty and cherishes the intention to teach. Hence the meaning is: "You are not at all in the situation that somebody should or ought to teach you" (Düsterdieck after Lücke and against Huther, who takes ἵνα in a weakened sense and thinks that it is simply used to indicate the object). Hence we may think also of Apostolical instruction, fraternal encouragement and (with reference to τις v. 21) friendly teaching, perhaps that of the Apostle himself (Bengel, de Wette, Lücke, Düsterdieck). There is no occasion here to think of πλανῶν; so Semler, Spener, (τὶς=who asserts a new revelation), Sander, Gerlach, Besser. But with reference to πάντα v. 20 and περὶ πάντων we must not restrict ἵνα διδάσκῃ ὑμᾶς to instruction concerning the false teachers (as Lücke does), although that is included (Huther).—It is important to bear in mind that this passage does not hold out the least encouragement, or give support to the vagaries of fanatics, because the Holy Spirit works on the basis of the word given and received, and does not communicate any thing *new*, but only imparts to believers clearer perceptions and views of that which they already have.

But as the ointment of Him teacheth you concerning all things, and is true and is not lie, and as it hath taught you, so abide in Him.—As we read τὸ αὐτοῦ χρῖσμα and not τὸ αὐτὸ χρῖσμα, it is only necessary to observe that Bengel ("*idem semper, non aliud atque aliud, sed sibi constans, et idem apud sanctos omnes*) finds here the unchangeableness, and Düsterdieck and others the identity of the chrism, which unceasingly teaches believers and which they have received from Him, the Christ; our reading brings out this identity and also reiterates its origin: [See *Appar. Crit.* v. 27., note 29, where the other reading is advocated, according to which we render "the same ointment," i. e., the identical χρῖσμα, ὃ ἐλάβετε.—M.].—The structure of this sentence presents peculiar difficulties. 'Αλλὰ introduces the antithesis μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ. While, on the one hand, the Apostle had assured them that they have no need of being taught by any one, because they have the Spirit reminding them of the words of the Lord and leading them into all truth, he now declares, on the other, and by way of antithesis, that they have need of abiding faithful with Him. Hence the words in parenthesis belong to the first ὡς, although the vivacity [of the Apostle's diction] which never repeats without indicating some new feature, has occasioned various modifications. The exhortation: μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ requires fidelity toward and steadfastness with *Christ*, as is unmistakable from the context and v. 28. Erasmus explaining ἐν τῷ χρίσματι erroneously thinks of the Holy Spirit, and Baumgarten-Crusius of the doctrine of the Spirit, while Schottgen strikingly observes: "*in Christo, quem Johannes semper in mente habet.*" The motive for abiding with Christ is: τὸ αὐτοῦ χρῖσμα διδάσκει περὶ πάντων. Hence the

context also recommends the well authenticated αὐτοῦ [the authorities on Braune's own showing are all the other way; they stand thus: αὐτοῦ C. Sin (?) against αὐτὸ A. B. (?) G. K.—M.]; it is the ointment of the Holy Ghost from Him [αὐτοῦ?], Christ, with [ἐν?] whom they are to remain; and this ointment teaches them concerning all things, as we read v. 20: οἴδατε πάντα. But not only the extent of that concerning which they are taught of the Holy Spirit is the motive for his exhortation that they should abide with Him. The chief motive is the characteristic: καὶ ἀληθές ἐστιν. The χρῖσμα is called absolutely ἀληθὲς, implying of course that that also which it teaches, is true; the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth (Jno. xiv. 17), therefore He leadeth you also into all truth (Jno. xvi. 13). So Düsterdieck; also Lücke, de Wette, Brückner, Ebrard. There is no ground for restricting the reference to that which the χρῖσμα teaches, as do Oecumenius, Theophylact, Luther, Neander, Besser, Huther. The importance of the true essence and substance of the χρῖσμα occasions the additional clause which denies all lie: καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ψεῦδος, and lie is not, is not extant. John evidently here recurred to the thought expressed in v. 21: πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐστιν, and that there is no lie where the Spirit teaches. Now the Apostle resumes with the fuller form καθὼς that which he had begun with ἀλλ' ὡς, and moreover, by way of reminding them that the Holy Spirit had taught them for some time: καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς. This Aorist after the preceding Present ought not to occasion any difficulty; and the καὶ before καθὼς instead of the ἀλλὰ before ὡς is readily accounted for by the one immediately preceding it; the sentence, thus resumed, connects with the testimony of the truth of the Spirit and His teaching; agreeably to which He has taught and teaches believers. Hence we should not divide the second clause of this verse into two parts (with Luther, Calvin, Baumgarten-Crusius, Sander, Brückner, Besser, Huther, and others), so that ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ αὐτοῦ χρῖσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς is the first antecedent, and καὶ ἀληθές ἐστιν καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν ψεῦδος its consequent, and again καὶ καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς is the second antecedent, and μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ its consequent. The explanation given by us is supported by Oecumenius, Theophylact, Lücke, de Wette, Neander, Düsterdieck, Ewald and others. [This applies only to the structure of the sentence, not to the exposition of the passage. As to the former we cannot but think that the one adopted by Huther and the many authorities who agree with him, is preferable to that of Braune, and on the following grounds: 1st, it assigns to περὶ πάντων its proper position, whereas in the former view is no relation whatsoever to μενεῖτε (μένετε) of the consequent; 2d, ἀλλὰ indicates that the Apostle is about to introduce an antithesis to οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε, a sentence in which the teaching of the χρῖσμα is to be described as exempting them from the necessity of another human teacher, and 3d, because the clause καὶ οὐκ ἐστι ψεῦδος added to ἀληθές ἐστι raises this thought above the character of a mere parenthetical and secondary observation, and stamps it as the leading thought. These are the grounds on which Luther, Calvin, Baumgarten-Crusius, Sander, Brückner, Besser, Huther, and many more, deem it preferable to divide the whole into two clauses, and to take καὶ ἀληθές ἐστι καὶ οὐκ ἐστι ψεῦδος as the consequent of the first clause. "But as the anointing teaches you all things, so it is true and is no lie," etc. (Luther).—M.].

The conclusion of the whole section, v. 28.

VER. 28. **And now, little children, abide with [in, ἐν] him.**

Καὶ νῦν connects the exhortation, repeated on account of its great importance and already expressed as a hope and in confidence v. 27, with the preceding verses. Καὶ νῦν occurs very often (Jno. xvii. 5; Acts iii. 17; iv. 29; vii. 34; x. 5; xxii. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 6), or καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ (Acts xiii. 11; xx. 22, 25), or νῦν οὖν (Acts xvi. 36; xxiii. 15), on the other hand ἀλλὰ νῦν (Luke xxii. 36), νῦν δὲ (Jno. viii. 40; ix. 41; xv. 22, 24; xviii. 36), but always so that out of the originally sentient description of the present there has sprung a certain logical significance in order to mark the consequences from a present situation, to draw an inference or conclusion, to annex the features involved in a given case or to denote an antithetical relation (Düsterdieck). Hence Paulus errs in rendering: "Even already now—as in opposition to the Parthian-magian doctrine, that union with God cannot take place except in the future kingdom of light."—The seasonable address τεκνία frees the Apostle's earnestness from all severity, and intensifies his exhortation as a paternal right, by reminding them of the fellowship of love as the consequence of his Apostolical discharge of duty. "*Repetitio est præcepti cum blanda appellatione, qua paternum erga eos amorem declaret*" (Estius). It is inconceivable how Socinus applies the ἐν αὐτῷ not to Christ, but to *Deus per Christum*, and how Semler could hit upon this doctrine. Rickli, who explains v. 27 of abiding in the confession that Jesus is the Christ, suggests here abiding in righteousness.—Now follows a reference to the judgment.

That if He shall be manifested we may have confidence and not be shamed away from Him at His coming.—Since ἐὰν and not ὅταν is the true reading, we have here not an intimation of the *time*, or the nearness of the time, but of the *reality* of the manifestation of Christ (Huther, Düsterdieck). Although the same word is applied to our Lord's appearing in flesh, in the form of a servant (ch. iii. 5. 8. ἐφανερώθη), still it may be applied with equal propriety to the future manifestation of His glory as in Col. iii. 4. That will be manifested which as yet is hidden. The Apostle now passes to the first person Plural: παῤῥησίαν σχῶμεν. He ever places himself under the laws (ch. i. 6 sqq.; ii. 2 sq.; iii. 16, 18 sqq.) and promises (ch. iii. 1 sqq.; 21; iv. 17; v. 11. 20), applicable to all without being able to exclude himself from the hope here presented (de Wette, Düsterdieck). Hence it is not from modesty (S. Schmid), nor because he would suffer loss if any members of his Church were falling away (Sander). Παῤῥησία is literally frankness, free-spokenness (Acts iv. 13. 29. 31; xxvi. 26; xxviii. 31; 1 Thess. ii. 2) then confident assurance with respect to all the threats and terrors of the judgment. The Vulgate translates *fiducia*, Luther properly *freudig* (vreidic *i. e.* free), *Freudigkeit* (*vreidicheit* *i. e.* freeness), which sheer

ignorance has turned into joyful (*freudig*) and joyfulness (*Freudigkeit*). Compare Vilmar *Pastoral-theolog. Blätter* 1861, Nos. 1. 2; Jütting, *Biblisches Wörterbuch* (1864) s. v.—A *Strasburg* edition of 1537, indeed, has already *Freudigkeit*, but the original word is *Freydigkeit* (Nürnberg ed. 1524), *Freydigkeyt* (Wittenberg ed. 1525), *Freidigkeit* (1530), and in a sermon on Jno. iv. 16–21 he speaks of *boldness* (*Trotz*) in the last day. The Greek Scholiasts and Lexicographers explain the word by ἄδεια, ἐξουσία, ἡ ἐπὶ τοῖς κακίστους εὔτολμος ἀπολογία. The ordinary antithesis is αἰσχύνεσθαι (Prov. xiii. 5; Phil. i. 20) to be ashamed, to shame oneself or feel ashamed, so as to depart from Him the Judge. The preposition ἀπὸ therefore is not=ὑπὸ (Socinus), nor=*coram* (Luther, Ewald), nor both together (S. Schmid, Sander), but=away from (Calvin, Beza, de Wette, Düsterdieck, Huther); but it is necessary to retain the Passive and not the Middle, because we do not retire and withdraw ourselves, but are rejected and driven away. Cf. Matth. xxv. 41. It is impossible to agree with Erasmus, who says: "*ut illum non pudeat nostri.*"—Παρουσία occurs only here in John's writings, but often elsewhere (Matth. xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39; 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 19 etc.), corresponds with φανερωθῇ, and as φανερωθῇ answers to παῤῥησίαν ἔχειν so παρουσία answers to αἰσχύνεσθαι. All this, connected with ἵνα, constitutes a motive for abiding with Him, walking in the light, in fellowship with Him.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The unmistakable reference here to the immanent Trinity is *theological* in the strictest sense of the word. According to the final clause of v. 22 and v. 23 we have here a reference to a *paternal relation* with respect to the Son, and to a *filial relation* with respect to the Father existing above and before the world within the Godhead. The Son is not only a power or principle before He became personal in the Christ, but He is personal in virtue of his Being, the Son of the Father who is a Person, the Son who as the Image of the Father is also a Person. But He became a historical Person, a Person belonging to the history of man in the Christ who did appear in Jesus. See Exegetical and Critical.

2. The knowledge of *God* without the knowledge of *Christ* is impossible, because the *knowledge* of God is impossible without *fellowship* with God, which is solely the result of confession of Jesus the Christ.

3. Fellowship with God is not the act of men but the act of God through Christ. It begins in the word which is preached and heard, continues in the communication and reception of the Chrisma, the Holy Spirit, and it consists in the truth and in the constancy of faith and confession. The Word of Christ and the Spirit given of Him must first come to us and do His work and in us and then we shall be able to abide with Him in virtue of His power.

4. The question here is as to what constitutes the difference between *esse in ecclesia* and *esse de ecclesia*. As surely as these two conditions must be distinguished from each other, so certain it is that in point of fact they do coëxist alongside each other. So Confess. Aug. Art. 8.: "*Quid sit ecclesia?—in hac vita multi hypocritæ et mali admixti—*; Apol. IV. *de ecclesia* § 11: *malos nomine tantum in ecclesia esse, non re, bonos vero re et nomine: Hieronymus enim ait: qui ergo peccator est aliqua sorde maculatus, de ecclesia Christi non potest appellari nec Christo subjectus dici.*"—"Like tares they stood in the same field alongside the wheat (Matth. xiii. 23 sqq.) and had part in the divine manifestations of grace whereby the whole field is made fertile and the genuine wheat brought to ripeness. But they shewed themselves to be tares and by their seceding did execute on themselves the divine judgment. Augustine and Bede, with whom Luther agrees in his second exposition, also compare the antichrists with the evil humours of the body. The body of Christ also, so long as it is undergoing the process of being cured, that is so long as it has not attained to perfect health through the resurrection, has such noxious humours (*quandoquidem adhuc curatur corpus ipsius et sanitas perfecta non erit nisi in resurrectione mortuorum; sic sunt in corpore Christi, quomodo humores mali*). Their expulsion liberates the body and enables it to attain unto perfect health (*quando evomuntur, tunc relevatur corpus*). But this does not happen to keep up Bede's figure, with the providential care of God" (Düsterdieck).

5. The present section cannot be pressed into the service of predestinarianism. Augustine, indeed, says with reference to this passage (*de bon. persev.* 11, 8): "*non erant ex nobis, quia non erant secundum propositum vocati, non erant in Christo electi ante constitutionem mundi—non erant prædestinati secundum propositum ejus, qui universa operatur.*" So Calvin, *Inst.* III. 24, 7. But although Calvin the theologian [German "*Dogmatiker,*" not=*dogmatist*, *i. e.*, one who is certain or presumes to say he knows, whether he be mistaken or in the right, but the teacher of a theological dogma—M.] cannot be corrected by Calvin the interpreter, yet Augustine the theologian can be corrected by Augustine the interpreter in his *Tractat. ad h. l.*, where he says: "De voluntate sua *unusquisque aut antichristus, aut in Christo est; qui se in melius commutat, in corpore membrum est, qui autem in malitia permanet, humor malus est.*" The Apostle distinguishes inward and true Christian fellowship from that which is only outward and in appearance; those who belong to the former are so thoroughly fettered in their believing and regenerated mind, that, as Lücke thinks, they can nevermore separate from that fellowship. It is, to use the striking language of the *Oxymoron* of Didymus, a *voluntaria necessitas*, but no *contrarietas naturarum*, although in the course of moral development there should arise a *diversitas substantiæ*.—The phrases οὐκ ἐξ ἡμῶν εἶναι and ἐξ ἡμῶν εἶναι used by the Apostle to denote simply the opposite results of the ethical life-process, which in the former case leads to ἐξελθεῖν and in the latter to μένειν μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν. But, as Augustine says, every Christian may become an antichrist, according as his will refuses to be determined to μένειν ἐν Χριστῷ, which beginning with the hearing of His word and advancing to πίστις εἰς αὐτόν, to childlike and unremitting trust and cleaving to Him, develops itself by ever determining,

guiding, strengthening, purifying and confirming the will, is a veritable history of the word heard with the outward ears and inwardly in the heart filling and conquering the heart until it has become *wholly* believing, but for all that may and does offer resistance at every point, so that it often does resist for some length of time and so undoes all its previous acquirements, that it often conceals unpardoned sins which may again draw it down or at least arrest its progress and bring it to the point that, unless it submit to being cleansed anew, it will apostatize and thus a Christian may become an antichrist, which is however of rare occurrence, because the eternal powers of the word of Christ and His Spirit are very strong and mighty and the heart of man has been created for and with special adaptation to said powers. Hence the universal experience that it is difficult to get to Christ through self-denying and world-renouncing penitence, but that it is even more difficult to get away from Christ through the denial of the conscience and of faith as well as of the word of Christ quickened in the conscience by faith,—and the Apostle speaks from this experience. But in all this there is neither predestination nor necessity, especially since the Apostle's exhortation to abide leaves room for the *possibility* of their apostasy, as to the reality of which the Apostle confidently entertains no fear in the case of those who are vital Christians. Nor is it to be overlooked that John does not throw out the faintest allusion to the difference between the *electi* and *vocati* and the *donum perseverantiæ*. In the passage Heb. vi. 4–6 the lapse of the truly regenerate (as is evident from their description) is supposed to be possible, but the re-conversion of such apostates only is said to be impossible, so that we ought to be afraid. [Huther: the words *εἰ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενήκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν* contain the idea that he who truly belongs to the Church will never leave it, but he that leaves it shows thereby that he did not truly belong to it. This confidence of the Apostle in the love of the Lord which keeps and preserves those who are His, and in the fidelity of those who have been redeemed by Him, seems to contradict the idea pre-supposed in Heb. vi. 4–6, that they also who were once enlightened and had tasted of the heavenly gift and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, can fall away. But John speaks here, as he does throughout his Epistle, absolutely, without any reference to the state of gradual development, from whence however it does by no means follow that he did not know it. The one circumstance that he *exhorts* believers, as such to abide in Christ, is sufficient to show that he does not wish to deny the *possibility* of their apostasy, all he is sure of, and rightly so, is this that he that does *not* abide, had never truly entered into fellowship with the Lord with his *whole* heart, but although he was touched by His love and felt somewhat of its power, he had not entirely abandoned and renounced the world."—M.].

6. The Apostle here asserts a double law of historical development in its definite application to the development of the kingdom of God. "Evil by a gradual process of development culminates, then in the conflict between the kingdom of God and evil, the former develops itself, and at length, through a new coming of Christ in power, the kingdom of Christ is once more subdued." (Neander). This is the one, and of the other the same author speaks thus: "In this respect also we shall see how the workings of one uniform law ever appear in the course of the development of the kingdom of God, that in good and evil there are certain individual personages constituting as it were, the centre and appearing especially as representatives of the conflicting principles, uniting and concentrating in themselves as one great whole, the fragments scattered in many individuals." "When in the times before the Reformation the secularized Church under the secularized papacy, was especially instrumental under the cloak of Christianity to obscure and oppose true Christianity, people might believe that they saw in this the visible manifestation of antichrist, and Matthias of Janow, the Bohemian reformer before Huss, might suppose to have detected the effect of Satan's craft in the circumstance that believers instead of identifying antichrist in the present, viz., the rule of the secularized Church and the sway of a superstition even unto the idolizing of the human, were beguiled into seeking it at some distant period." The increasing revelation of the depths of evil in the world, runs therefore parallel to the development of the kingdom of God even up to its ultimate completion and both pass through personages in whom the former does concentrate. See also Düsterdieck: "The development of the Christian principle and that of the antichristian principle are reciprocally related. Christian truth cannot be revealed without forthwith exciting the contradiction of the darkness. The wheat and the tares grow together until they are ripe. The antichristian spirit works already in many antichrists; but the one antichrist is still future, still to come, and is only announced by his precursors. Although therefore the last hour has already come, yet its full close is still to come, viz., the real, personal advent of the Lord which will take place immediately after the appearance of the personal antichrist. But John did neither tell us *when* this antichrist would come nor give us a chronological clue to the exact time of the personal advent of Christ. In both respects he confines himself to the statement *that* the events are to take place."—

7. Athough John in giving prominence to the marrow and vitalizing centre of Christianity, viz., to the belief that Jesus is the Christ and the Son of God, does not warrant us to undervalue the articulated confession of faith as a whole or as to its component parts, which are only developments of the pushing germ, he yet attaches, and for this very reason, the greatest importance to the *faithfulness of abiding*, the *fides qui creditur*, with reference to said centre.

8. His account of the *χρῖσμα* and its gifts, characteristically and emphatically adverts to the universal priesthood, indicating its origin and glory.

9. The "critical ability" (Düsterdieck) of Christians founded on the full knowledge of the truth, like the advancing knowledge of the truth itself, goes hand in hand with progressive holiness. The point throughout is not mere knowledge, tidings or information of a life *in* and of

(from) God, but the actual possession and enjoyment of this life, the life itself and the personal converse of the human soul with the living and revealed God; and it concerns man's inmost and most profound being, which is neither the understanding nor the reason, but the will, and the point in question is not *science* but *con*science.

10. It is only in the way of obedience to the word and will of God that man is able to keep and intensify fellowship with Him in order that he may become a partaker of the divine Being, the divine Nature. It is *contrary* to the *will* of God that man departs *from* the *Being* of God until he is wholly rejected.

11. The decision and the separation will not take place until the last, the last judgment; consider this.—

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

See what time it is in the kingdom of God? 1. Hearken to the *word* which is preached (vv. 18, 24); 2. be led by the *Spirit* whom thou hast received (vv. 20, 27); 3. take note of the *separations* which take place in the Church (vv. 19, 22); 4. hold fast to Jesus the Christ, who is the Son of the Father (vv. 26, 28).—In all the separations in the Church be sure not to forget to decide.—In every separation the sorrow of having been deceived before is connected with the joy of greater purity hereafter.—In the uncertainty as to who are true vital Christians take care lest thou lose the conviction that the vital Christian abides constant.—Act as Gideon did who encountering the Midianites numbering 135,000 with an army of 32,000 at the Lord's bidding reduced the same by 22,000 and made a selection of 300 from the remaining 10,000 even as directed by the Lord, and then gained a glorious victory with them (Judg. vii.).—The source of the anointing is the Holy Ghost, its pre-requisite regeneration, its power an assured conviction of the importance of the truth, its impulse an earnest desire to bring it home to the hearts of others; it was a protection from the hierarchism and episcopalianism of the 2d and 3d centuries. Is. xli. 15 applies to it. [I should rather say in more strict agreement with the text that the chrism of the Holy Ghost from Christ is a sure protection from any and every form of spiritual secessionism, separatism and individualism.—M.]. Because of a sorrowful experience in the Church do not give up the joy of the glory of the Church.—Comparison of the ointment as the figure or symbol of the Holy Spirit: 1, its value; 2, its use in the anointing of kings, priests and prophets; 3, its power of strengthening and stimulating the spirit of life; 4, its influence on a life well-pleasing to God; 5, its far-spreading fragrance.—The fundamental doctrine of salvation is: Jesus is the Christ. 1, With it and in it we find our way into the rich heart of God and bring God into our poor heart; 2, in opposition to it we bring eternal ruin into our heart and ourselves into eternal ruin. Or, 1, By it you learn the corrupting false teachers; 2, in it the true and living Christian shows himself; 3, out of it you pass to the inheritance of God.—Do not drive Christ and His word from thy heart, or Christ will drive thee from His kingdom.—v. 28. *Confirmation-address.*

GREGORY:—"*Nisi Spiritus Sanctus intus sit qui doceat, doctoris lingua extus in vanum laborat.*"

AUGUSTINE:—"*Cathedram in cœlo habet, qui intus docet.*"

LUTHER:—It is dangerous and terrible to believe something against the uniform testimony, faith and doctrine of the universal holy Church, which has now thus held it unanimously in every place from the beginning these fifteen hundred years past.—Many a man has a paternoster round his neck and a rogue in his heart.

STARKE:—As the betrayer of Christ was one of His most intimate Apostles, so antichrist did not arise among Jews or Turks, but in the very midst of Christendom.—The Church remaineth not without offences of which that is not least that within her fold there arise men who hold false doctrine and apostatize from the known truth; the tares do not grow by themselves, but in the midst of the wheat.—Constancy in good is an infallible sign of a true Christian, just as temporizing and changeableness indicate a false heart.—Christians are anointed, and their name should daily remind them of what they owe to God and their neighbour as spiritual kings, priests and prophets.—A teacher ought not to despise his hearers, for they also, if they believe, are anointed with the Holy Spirit and the knowledge of divine truths, although there may be differences in the measure of their anointing.—He also denies Christ the Saviour, who does not prove in deed that He is *His* Saviour who has indeed delivered him from the guilt and punishment of sin.—We have need to be especially on our guard against the denial of Christ which takes place, not only in words and in doctrine, but also in our life.—The word of God must remain in the whole man, and not only enter his understanding.—A Christian, an anointed one, that is his name, but also the greatest prerogative to divine wisdom, it opens to him the school in which the most learned are seated below on the bench of humility, who follow in the simplicity of their heart, who know all things, and ever learn what they know, love and do.—As is a king without a kingdom, a ruler without subjects, a general without soldiers, so is a Christian without the anointing. Because the last coming of the Lord will be terrible, we should be diligent to be so well prepared that we may be found worthy to stand before the Son of Man.—The day of our Lord's coming may properly be called the believers' day of honour, for they shall be manifested, declared righteous, and advanced to the full enjoyment of heavenly blessing.

SPENER:—It is a great blessing that God does not allow the heavenly [?] deceivers to remain in the Church but overrules it that they are made known and we learn to be on our guard against them, that they must manifest themselves and make themselves known, whereby the danger is lessened and believers rendered more cautious and prompted to be diligent in prayer and to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling.—Even those who truly believe and have made great advances in the faith, may be deceived, and therefore let those who think that they stand, take heed lest they fall. None but those who have the Holy Spirit and the anointing can be sufficiently on their guard against the lies

of antichrist. All other knowledge is too weak by far to be able to withstand temptation and spiritual conflicts.

UHLHORN:—*He only has God, who has Him as the Triune God.* Let us only begin with what the Apostle puts in the middle, *He that hath not the Son, neither hath he the Father*, add that with which he begins, *of the Son we can only know through the Holy Spirit*, and conclude the statement in virtue of what the Apostle says, that the anointing cometh from Him who is holy: *The Holy Ghost cometh from the Father and the Son.*

LAVATER:—Every one who is not an *evangelical* Christian, does not believe in Jesus Christ, is an atheist.

HEUBNER:—A hostile power, an opposition to Christianity, has stirred from the beginning. And this is a recommendation of Christianity; a proof of the mighty power of Christianity against evil, which is terrible to the wicked one. The more the good raises itself the more also does evil bestir itself. Where God builds a temple, Satan is sure to build a chapel by the side of it.—It serves also to exercise and try the soldiers of Christ. Without an opposing power, the divine drama would be without life or interest.—Unbelief which pretends that the kernel and characteristics of Christianity are irrational, is a very important epoch in this history.—Who thought Christianity imperilled by the growth of antichrist would betray great weakness of heart and understanding and want of confidence. The Christian should rejoice at every further manifestation: the end is drawing nearer: the catastrophe in the kingdom of Christ is the point to which the eyes of Christians are longingly directed.—The enemies of Christianity draw nourishment from the Church: it is in their interest not to suffer themselves to be deprived of the name "Christian;" they would then accomplish less and be less dangerous.—The manifestation of all, the good as well as the bad, is the design of the Kingdom of God. The evil cannot long conceal or disguise itself or stand back: it only waits for the time of coming out. God wills it thus. The appearance of evil tries and purifies the Church. It is a refreshing relief to Christians to see the separation of the unclean.—A Christian is insured and protected from false teachers. He has the Holy Spirit 1. Who interpenetrates every thing like precious perfume, enters into every thing, and imparts to it fragrance and the breath of life—to his thinking, judging, feeling and willing. The Christian is thereby clothed with a royal and priestly dignity in the Kingdom of God (Rev. i. 6). The anointing is the signature of the Christian. 2. The Spirit enables him to try, to identify the spirit of error, to judge; to such a Christian no false teacher can be dangerous.—The Christian has a fine sense of discrimination (*sagax odoratus*); he quickly perceives the essence and tendency of every doctrine; hence his Christian severity of judgment and his antipathy to syncretism.—Bad opinions, seductive principles among Christians, originate not in Christianity. The Church of Christ must not be charged with the evil that is in it.—He that will not know God in Jesus—where else will he know God?—There is no revelation of God which resembles the revelation in Christ; if one is not satisfied with this revelation, which revelation will satisfy him?—Whether they like or do not like it, neologians are obliged to assert that true Christianity was unknown before them; for what they now call Christianity is known to the whole antiquity.—The true Christian faith is immutable and needs no perfecting.—This faith is of the utmost importance; our eternal salvation depends upon it; it is not a useless, subtle question raised by the schools, but it concerns *the promise of eternal life*, and the virtue of this promise depends on the Person of Jesus; only if He is truly the Son of God He is able to promise and give eternal life. This must attach us strongly to the faith, and those who have felt the power of this faith, live and die for this faith.—Even anointed Christians stand in need of warning and admonition, because deceivers are never quiet and because within us there is not wanting that which meets them half-way.—Other gifts decrease in the course of time, the Holy Spirit does not decrease. Other frames of mind and tendencies of thought change, the Holy Spirit does not change. Yield to the promptings of the Spirit and be vigilant lest thou mistake thy own spirit for the Holy Spirit and be deceived. Be pure and meek.—Abiding with Christ and in Him in steadfastness of faith and faithful following Him is the more *honourable*, the more fall away from Him, and it is necessary, because our acceptance depends on it. If one becomes unfaithful to Christ, how can he appear before Him with joyfulness [confidence?]? *That* thought has an overwhelming influence on the heart of a Christian. How shall unbelievers appear before Him who to please the world leave Christ, and esteem the world's honours more highly than the grace of Christ? How well it would be if all men would only examine themselves in all their judging and doing; could you act thus in the presence of Jesus? would you dare to say such and such a thing in the presence of Jesus? would you dare to maintain such an opinion before Him? If you are honest and conscientious according to your interpretation, so that He may not even blame you, why have you twisted my words after your liking?

BESSER:—It *is* the last hour. But those who read the history of the Church wrongly, and consider the time of her highest inward beauty and manifest power over the world to belong to an earthly future, will be inclined to suspect the holy Apostle, to have been in error for assuring us to have experienced the beginning of the last hour; those, on the other hand, who consider that the Sun of the Gospel shone in his brightest splendor, when in the preaching of the Apostles he came forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber and rejoiced as a giant to run his race from one end of the heavens back to the same end again and that there sounds through the whole history of the Church the sigh of the saints "Abide with us, Lord Jesus, for it is toward evening"—aye, that even her most glorious victories, like the victory of the Reformation, are only like the reflection of the setting sun on the darkening clouds,—those who see this cease to be surprised at what the Apostles tell us of the last hour and

read the merciful cause of this prolonged duration of the last hour, prolonged for more than eighteen hundred years, in the words of the Apostle "the Lord is long-suffering to us-ward" (2 Pet. iii. 9).—We must not only be on our guard against one antichrist, one great adversary and deceiver, but against a multitudinous progeny of the antichristian seed.—When somebody praised the sainted Oettinger shortly before his death, on account of his great wisdom, he replied with a smile: "Yes, I have learned many things; but the most precious knowledge I learned as a child in Luther's Lesser Catechism, which comprises every thing which I desire to keep and carry away with me to the seeing face to face." —A learner of the Catechism, that hath the Holy Spirit, is able so far to discover all errors which militate against the Gospel, that he is protected from deception and may immoveably stand on the foundation of his faith.—Neither the Jesus of the rationalists nor the Christ of the philosophers hurts the kingdom of Satan.—The antichrists showed themselves to be antitheists.—Declension begins with men's loathing that which they have heard from the beginning (Rieger:)—Every true doctrine the assertion of which is assigned to the church during the time of her growth, is already contained in the treasury of Holy Scripture.

Johann Tauler had preached many a learned sermon when Nicolaus of Basle, the Waldensian, visited and told him: "You are a kind-hearted man and a great priest, but have not yet tasted in truth the sweetness of the Holy Spirit." From that time Tauler sought the true Teacher in the Scripture and the cross, who teaches us more in one hour than all earthly teachers can teach us to the last day.

[Warburton:—The late appearance of antichrist was a doctrine so universally received in the primitive Church, that it was like a proverbial saying among them; and thence St. John takes occasion to moralize on the doctrine, and warn his followers against that spirit, which in after times was to animate "the man of sin." "Little children," says he, "it is the last time; and as ye have heard that antichrists shall come, even now there are many antichrists: whereby ye know that it is the last time." As much as to say, we are fallen into the very dregs of time, as appears from that antichristian spirit, which now so much pollutes the Churches; for you know it is a common saying, that antichrist is to come in those wretched days. The Apostle goes on to employ the same allusion through the rest of the Epistle; v. 22. ch. iv. 8; 2 Jno. 7. Where we see the appellation "antichrist" is employed to signify an enemy of God and godliness in general, by the same figure of speech that Elias was designed in those times to signify *a prophet*, and Rachel, *a daughter of Israel;* and that in these times Judas is used for *a traitor*, and Nero for *a tyrant*. But as these convertible terms necessarily suppose that they originally belonged to persons of the like characters, who had them in proper, so does the name "antichrist" transferred by St. John to certain of his impious contemporaries, as necessarily suppose, that there was one who should arise in the latter times, to whom the title eminently belonged; as marked out in the prophecies by the proper name of antichrist.—M.]

[Hurd's two sermons on 1 Jno. ii. 18, the one entitled "*Prophecies concerning Antichrist*," the other "*Prejudices against the doctrine of Antichrist*," are well worth reading, as they embody much of the literature on the subject.—M.].

[Whitby:—To deny the Father here, is not to deny Him to be the true God, as the heathens did: but 1. to deny the truth of His testimony, see ch. v. 10; Jno. iii. 33; 2. to deny the doctrine of the Father, or that doctrine which proceedeth from Him; "for He whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God," Jno. iii. 34. Whence it is evident, that he who denieth the Son, cannot thus retain the true knowledge of the Father; Jno. i. 18; Matth. xi. 27. By Him alone can we come acceptably to the Father, so as to have life; for "He is the Way, and the Truth and the Life," Jno. xiv. 6. And by Him alone are we taught how to "worship the Father in spirit and in truth," Jno. iv. 23, 24. Hence Christ so often tells the Jews, they therefore wanted the true knowledge of the Father, because they knew not Him, Jno. viii. 19; xiv. 7; xvi. 3.—M.].

[Abp. Sharp:—Abundance of fanaticism, enthusiasm and other mischiefs have been brought into the Church of Christ, by the misinterpreting and misapplying of those texts which speak of the gifts of the Spirit, which some men so understand as to make no distinction between the times then and the times now.—(Joel ii. 28; Acts ii. 17; Jer. xxxi. 34; 1 Jno. ii. 27.)—Hence they conclude that in these days, which are the last days, the Spirit of God is poured upon all flesh, and that every one hath a right to expect immediate impulses and revelations, as to what he is to believe and to practise: that by this assistance of the Spirit, every brother may understand the mysteries of the Holy Scriptures, without the troublesome way of studying human learning; nay and may take upon himself the pastoral office, and become a guide and teacher of others, without any warrant from human authority, merely upon the impulse of the Spirit of God. These consequences have been drawn from these and such texts of Scripture: and so far have they been promoted and improved by several amongst us, that reason and prudence and all acquired learning, are rather accounted by them hinderances to the work of God's Church, than any ways contributing to it. Nay, they are arrived to a pitch above the Scriptures themselves, which they look upon as a dead letter in comparison of the light within them, the witness, the anointing which they have received from above, which is the only measure with them of truth and falsehood, of good and evil. The colour, which these enthusiasts derive for this their notion from the letter of some passages of the Old and New Testament, would quite vanish, if they would but take care to distinguish between the effects of the Spirit, which belonged to the converting of the world, and those which were to be His constant permanent operations among such as were already Christians. There is no one will deny but the Apostles, and those in their times, had these inspirations, these revelations they speak of: and the texts, that they produce, are some of them plain proofs that those promises were made good.

They did see visions, and were endowed with extraordinary talents of wisdom and knowledge, without human methods, and might expect particular impulses of the Holy Ghost upon occasions, where they wanted either light or direction; and all this was indeed little enough for the discharge of that great work they had upon their hands, namely, the bringing of the world over from Judaism and heathenism to Christianity. But that being done once, and the Gospel of Christ, and all things pertaining to it, being plainly left in writing by the Apostles or Apostolical men, as there would be from henceforward no need of those assistances of the Spirit, so it would be a vain thing to expect them. We are not to desire those immediate revelations, nor to expect that God should vouchsafe them, if we prayed for them. God hath declared all His will, that is necessary for us to know, by our Saviour and His Apostles: and the rules which they have given us, together with our own natural light and reason, and the other outward means and helps of instruction, which are every day at hand among us, are sufficient, abundantly sufficient, to guide and direct us, both as to belief and practice, through all the cases and emergencies that can ordinarily happen to us. And in extraordinary cases God will take care, some way or other, that we shall not be at a loss. And therefore to pretend to the Spirit in these days, either for preaching, or praying, or prophesying, or denouncing God's judgments, or for any other thing, in such a way as implies immediate inspiration; or to set up a light within us, contrary to the light of reason, or different from the light of Scripture without us, is the extreme of folly, enthusiasm and madness."—M.].

[The *chrism* is 1. a *general* gift, vouchsafed to all *Christians;*
2. not transient but permanent;
3. leads them into all truth;
4. moves them to the practice of all the precepts of Christ;
5. assures them of their Christian privileges; (children of God, members of Christ and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven);
6. teaches them in all things; they are therefore disciples and learners all the days of their life;
7. preserves their fellowship with the Father and with the Son; (*abide*).
8. and makes them the Temples of God.—M.].

III. PRINCIPAL PART THE SECOND.

CHAPTER II. 29—V. 12.

HE THAT IS BORN AGAIN (OUT) OF (THE BEING OF) GOD THE RIGHTEOUS (II. 29) IS A MIRACLE OF HIS LOVE NOW AND HEREAFTER (III. 1–3), IS BOUND BY HIS WILL (III. 4–10*a*), ESPECIALLY TO PRACTISE BROTHERLY LOVE (III. 10*b*–18), IS BLESSED BEFORE HIM AND IN HIM (III. 19–24), TRYING LIKE GOD THE FALSE SPIRITS (IV. 1–6), HE ENJOYS THE LOVE OF GOD AND EXHIBITS BROTHERLY LOVE (IV. 7–21), HE TRIUMPHS OVER THE WORLD AND IS SURE OF ETERNAL LIFE (V. 1–12).

1. *The leading thought: He that is born again of God the Righteous doeth righteousness.* Ch. ii. 29.

29 If ye know that he is righteous, ye know[1] that[2] every one that doeth righteousness is born of him.[3]

Verse 29. [[1] German: "If ye know that He is righteous, know ye." The Imperative is found in the margin of E. V., Wicl. Tynd. Cranm. Rhemish, Syriac. Latin (except Pagn. Beza), German, Dutch, Italian and French versions, and adopted by the authorities cited below in *Exegel. and Crit.*—M.]

[2] καὶ after ὅτι and before πᾶς is the reading of A. C. Sin., many cursives and versions. "*Cujus addendi nulla causa erat; ex Johannis vero usu est.*" (Tischendorf, who omits it in his 7th edition). [If καὶ is genuine it serves "to mark the congruity of the inference and the premise," as Ebrard observes.—M.]

[[3] German: retaining καὶ: "that also every one that doeth the righteousness hath been born of Him."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The *subject* of δίκαιος is not specified. It has to be ascertained either from the connection with the preceding verses, or from the verse itself. On this point Sander very justly lays down the Canon: "If δίκαιος designates Christ, ἐξ αὐτοῦ refers to Him. But if the latter is impossible, that is, if ἐξ αὐτοῦ must be referred to God, δίκαιος also must designate God." There is no *formal* connection of this verse with the preceding verses containing reference to Christ; it is the beginning of a new section. Hence this verse, standing alone, must be explained by itself, and the question of the subject has to be determined from an examination of the verse itself. Hence there is no warrant for an outward occasion of a reference to Christ, especially since the oneness of the Father and the Son of God and Christ, is everpresent to the mind of John, so that he frequently and easily passes from the one to the other without a special indication of such transition. Nor can we gather from the

word δίκαιος whether the reference is to Christ or to God, for it is applied to God in ch. i. 9 and to Christ in ch. ii. 1. But ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται decides the point. The idea of γεννᾶσθαι ἐκ Χριστοῦ or τέκνα Χριστοῦ notwithstanding Spener's reference to Is. ix. 6; liii. 10; Ps. xxii. 31, cx. 3; Matth. ix. 2; Jno. xiii. 33; Heb. ii. 17 occurs nowhere. But γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ occurs ch. iii. 9; v. 18 cf. vv. 1. 4; ch. iv. 7; and τέκνα θεοῦ in the very next verse ch. iii. 1: consequently: he is born of (out of) *God*. "*Justus justum gignit*" (Bengel). We have therefore the valid conclusion: God is righteous, he that is born of (out of) God doeth righteousness. [*Like begets like.*—M.]. Hence Christ is neither the subject of δίκαιος and ἐξ αὐτοῦ (a Lapide, Bengel, Rickli, Frommann, al.), nor *Christ* the subject of δίκαιος and *God* the subject of ἐξ αὐτοῦ (Storr, Lücke, Heubner al.); but *God* is the subject of δίκαιος and ἐξ αὐτοῦ (Neander, Köstlin, Düsterdieck, Ebrard, Huther, al.).

VER. 29. **If ye know that He is righteous.**—Besides what has been said on δίκαιος at ch. i. 9; ii. 1, we have further to add that if God is ἅγιος as to His *Essence*, He is δίκαιος as to His *doing*, and just because He is ἀγάπη (ch. iv. 16), His energizing Will aims at the revelation of His holiness in laws at once agreeable to the holiness of His Being and adjusted to the nature and destination of His creatures, for whose benefit they are enacted, showing how His words are to be kept and His promises to be fulfilled, and how those who obey Him are to be rewarded and those who disobey him are to be punished. Legislation, denunciation and promise, punishment and reward, redemption and the forgiveness of sins are the acts and exhibitions of His δικαιοσύνη, which is the energy of His holy love directed outwardly, or the energy of His love conjoined with His holiness. Accordingly there is no righteousness whatever outside of God, or separate from God and His energizing, so that He is not only the prototype and original, but also the primordial source of all human righteousness. This is an important object of Christian knowledge, which, whilst it may indubitably be presupposed in the case of all Christians, is not always and readily found in the desired strength and purity in individual Christians. Hence ἐὰν εἰδῆτε. The Apostle appeals to the consciousness of the Church, desiring not to teach anything new but to render their knowledge vital and fruitful. [Hollaz: "*Justitia Dei est attributum divinum* ἐνεργητικόν, *vi cujus Deus omnia quæ æternæ suæ legi sunt conformia, vult et agit; creaturis convenientes leges præscribit, promissa facta hominibus implet, bonos remuneratur et impios punit.*" M.].

Know ye.—Since it is grammatically correct (Kühner II., p. 550) that such a supposition may be followed either by the Imperative or the Indicative of a chief tense, especially of the Future, the prominent use of the Indicative Future, which is very nearly related to the Imperative, renders it highly probable that our γινώσκετε is the Imperative. Now since we read at ch. v. 15 (referred to by de Wette and Düsterdieck) ἐὰν οἴδαμεν—οἴδαμεν, but in the verse immediately succeeding ch. iii. 1, ἴδετε (to which Huther calls attention), the latter consideration decidedly outweighs the former and constrains us to take γινώσκετε in the Imperative. To this must still be added the sense of the verb and the verse. The verb γινώσκειν denotes an activity ever deepening, quickening and enlarging, the knowing (εἰδέναι) grows thus into experimental knowing (γινώσκειν). The truth is the object of all knowing, and the Christian shall be led into *all* truth, that is, he is to know thoroughly, to pass on from one point which he knows and whereof he has cognition, to another [and a deeper knowing and insight—M.], even by the aid of the Holy Spirit. If ye know that He is righteous, ye know not yet, but are to know that—. Hence we must not construe here in the Indicative (Beza, Bengel, Düsterdieck, Ewald, Neander and al.) but in the Imperative (Vulgate, Grotius, de Wette, Lücke, Ebrard, Huther and al.).

That also every one who doeth righteousness has been born (out) **of Him.**—Καί indicates the relation of appurtenance and congruity of the second to the first thought. It does not belong, however, to γινώσκετε, as if only expressing a logical relation (Düsterdieck): if ye know—then ye know also (Neander); but it belongs to the subject, πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν, and sets forth the relation of the two truths: God is righteous, and every one who doeth righteousness, is born of God. We have here to do with a real relation.—Ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην is he that has the δικαιοσύνη within himself and causes it to be operative in his walk, his works, his words, his conduct and thinking, in his judgment, attitude, bearing and appearance, to come forth and become perceptible in himself. Doing is here not a merely outward and isolated act but an activity continuous and connected, having as much respect to the inward as to the outward, the energy of something possessed inwardly, of a gift received, of a communicated nature and life. Ποιῶν is emphatic; righteousness must be *done*, and not only lauded, confessed, preached, known, felt and believed. It may be done as yet imperfectly, in weakness, under repeated interruptions, but *every* Christian must and does do righteousness, πᾶς "*omnis et solus*" (Bengel). Nor is it enough to do only some parts of this righteousness, respect must be had to the whole τὴν δικαιοσύνην. As to the nature of this δικαιοσύνη we have to think of the righteousness which comes from God, passes before Him, is His and His work. It is, therefore, a righteousness, Divine as to its kind, an effluence of God's primordial righteousness, from God Himself. It manifests itself in obedience to the Divine commandments, in shunning sin, in striving after holiness, in love of the brethren, in the life and growth of faith; and although much be wanting in its full exhibition and its perfection lie far remote, still this is the righteousness here referred to. Compare ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ch. i. 6 and צְדָקָה עָשָׂה Gen. xviii. 19; Is. lvi. 1; Ps. xiv. 15.—This points to a powerful and specific cause and condition, without which ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην is impossible and inconceivable: ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται The Present ποιῶν, and the Perfect γεγέννηται denote the sequence; the first in order of existence is: *to be born of* (out of) *God*, the second, which

is the effect and result of the former, is: *to do the righteousness.* Precisely this order was necessarily implied in the exposition of the substance of ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην.—As with regard to δίκαιος the turns δικαιοσύνη and ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην have to be taken in a full and living sense, so likewise the phrase ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεννᾶσθαι. The reference is consequently to a beginning life, a birth, a coming into existence (becoming) of something which did not or does not yet exist; not only a change or an improvement, but something altogether new—and that *out of God.* The sense of the preposition ἐξ also, has doubtless to be held fast; out of Him, that is out of God's Self-own Holy Essence. "*Nasci ex Deo est naturam Dei acquirere*" (Luther) or "*constituitur in quadam participatione supernaturali esse divini*" (de Lyra), having received a new being or nature out of God (Spener), perfectly analogous to γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 4.—Cf. Jno. iii. 3, 5, 6; i. 12, 13; Tit. iii. 5; Eph. iv. 23, 24; Rom. xii. 2; 1 Pet. i. 3, 23. There is a Divine seed (ch. iii. 9) in those who are born out of God; they have not become God, deified or absorbed in God or God absorbed in them, but only partakers of the Divine nature, germ-like, like new-born babes, so that a beginning has been made, but only a beginning, although the beginning of a life, Divine, coming from and leading to God, whose perfection is not wrought magically or by enchantment at one stroke, but is subject to the law of Divinely appointed growth. This birth out of God is a translation of man from death to life (ch. iii. 14), brings him to the Light of the world and gives him eternal life (ch. v. 11, 20), and effects the blessed result that God is in us and we in Him (ch. iv. 15), as the children of God (ch. iii. 1, 2, 9, 10), out of God (ch. iii. 10). But this is brought about by means of an ethical life-process (ch. iii. 9; v. 1). We *become* the children of God. But nothing is said here on this point, or on the mediation of Christ and faith in Him. We have therefore to set aside all expositions, which weaken the thought, like those of Socinus ("*Dei similem esse*") and Rosenmüller ("*Amari a Deo*" and "*beneficiis ab eo ornari,*" or introduce a foreign element, like that of Hilgenfeld (a destiny and necessity of nature represented in gnostico-dualistic manner), and those which misapprehend or reverse the right order in making the doing of righteousness the condition of our adoption (Socinus, Episcopius, Semler, al.); the false relation also of doing righteousness to standing in the judgment (a Lapide, Emser, Estius) has to be excluded as irrelevant.—Lücke (2d ed.) says "properly one ought to have expected ὅτι πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐξ αὐτοῦ ποιεῖ τὴν δικαιοσύνην;" this is not correct although the thought is correct *per se.* John makes the perceptible and cognizable ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην a sure token of the hidden life of the inner man, which began with the birth out of God, of the adoption, of the life out of which death cannot destroy and which can glory against the judgment. The relation between γεγεννῆσθαι ἐκ θεοῦ and ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην is exactly like that between κοινωνίαν ἔχειν μετὰ θεοῦ and περιπατεῖν ἐν τῷ φωτί in ch. i. 6.

Connection with the preceding, and development in the sequel.—The rich and independent thought is the *introduction* to or the *text* of the next part. Its fundamental tone is δίκαιός ἐστι, parallel to φῶς ἐστι, which is a further confirmation of the presumption that God is the subject. It is impossible to restrict the notion δίκαιος by the side of the inference which is here drawn from it, to *justitia judicialis.* Hence we must not seek or find an internal reciprocal relationship between the *judgment*, (to which v. 28 is supposed to refer, but of which nothing is said, the reference being simply to Christ's Advent), and *righteousness;* we need not think of the *judicial* function of the Divine righteousness nor of our being able to stand before the *righteous* Judge only through doing *righteousness.* But John in concluding the first part with the strong consolation which on the ground of the walk in light, adverts with hopeful promise to the blessed destination of Christians, passes from the παῤῥησία in the Advent to the thought of the Sonship, of the hope, the glory and heritage of the children of God. This is the connection with what goes before. The next main part of the Epistle is analytically divided by the development of this idea of a glorious birth out of God.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. God's attribute of righteousness is not only energetically active, but also communicative.

2. The import of regeneration should be laid hold of by its indispensable consequence; viz.: ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην, and even its nature defined as a beginning of a new, Divine life.

3. The vital power and root of a truly valid righteousness in our being and walking, lie not in man as he is, but only in God, and out of God only in man as he has become a Christian.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Determine [find out experimentally,—M.] what thou knowest.—Not only every gift of God is good and perfect, but both all the good, and all perfection are the gifts of Him, the Righteous one.—God gives and man—not only *has* but *becomes* [comes into existence.—M.].—God rules over thee and has His work in thee, that thou mayest become and remain His child.—Whatever is Divine prompts and impels the ethical, by which the Divine may be identified.—The *cause* of regeneration is the righteous God, and an ethical status is its *mark* and *sign.*

SPENER:—No man has by nature the power to do right or to work righteousness, but it comes only from his regeneration, from Christ, who makes us strong by regeneration and His dwelling in us.

LANGE:—The Gospel is careful with the law to connect the righteousness of faith with the righteousness of life and therein lies a true mark of a sincere evangelical preacher and a sincere evangelical hearer.

STARKE:—Believers are assured by their *doing right*, that they have become the children of God by grace, that consequently they may joyfully appear before the judgment seat of God knowing that no Father will suffer his children to be put to confusion of face, and in this faith and undoubting hope they may joyfully take leave of this world.

BESSER:—The Apostle's rejoicing over the

present power of the children of God over sin is, as it were, a ladder on which he ascends to the glory that is still reserved for them; and the hope of this future glory impels him once more to charge his little children to use with all diligence the Christian virtue already accorded to them, uninfluenced by the seducers who pretended to be able to see the Lord without holiness.

[EZEK. HOPKINS:—Those who do God's commandments, have a right of heirship and inheritance unto eternal life. For they are born of God and therefore heaven is their patrimony, their paternal estate: for the Apostle saith "Every one that doeth righteousness is born of God," and if they are born of God then according to St. Paul's argument Rom. viii. 17: "If children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ," who is the "heir of all things." The trial of thy legitimacy, whether thou art a true and genuine son of God will lie upon thy obedience to His commands, for "in this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil; whosoever is born of God does not commit sin . . . . and whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God." 1 Jno. iii. 9. 10. Now if by our obedience and dutifulness, it appears, that we are indeed the children of God, our Father will certainly give us a child's portion; and that is no less than a kingdom. So saith our Saviour Luke xii. 32; "Fear not, little flock: for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."—M.].

---

2. *The glory of the Sonship.*

CHAPTER III. 1–3.

1 Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed[1] upon us[2], that we should be
called the sons[3] of God[4]: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him
2 not. Beloved, now are we the sons of God[5], and it doth not yet appear[6] what we shall
be: but[7] we know that when he shall appear[8], we shall be like him; for[9] we shall see
3 him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him[10] purifieth himself, even as
he is pure[11].

Verse 1 [1] δέδωκεν B. C. Sin; others, A. G. ἔδωκεν. [German: "hath given."—M.]
[2] ἡμῖν A. C. Sin; others read ὑμῖν; so B. K. [The latter reading probably originated in the reference to the 2 pers. Plural; ἴδετε.—M.]
[[3] Greek: τέκνα θεοῦ; German: "children of God;" the Article is superfluous and unauthorized and "*children*" is decidedly preferable to "*sons*."—M.]
[4] καὶ ἐσμέν after κληθῶμεν is inserted by A. B. C. Sin; many cursives and versions. Vulg.: *et simus*; others: *et sumus*. Erasmus took it to be an addition; the Recept. omitted it. The false translation of the Vulgate was a stumbling-block to many, also Luther, and they omitted the words accordingly. [The German retains καὶ ἐσμέν and renders in an independent clause: "*and we are* (it *i. e.* God's children)." Oecumenius explains: ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τέκνα αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι τε καὶ κληθῆναι and Theophylact: γενέσθαι τε καὶ λογισθῆναι. The authorities are decidedly in favour of the genuineness of the addition.—M.]

Verse 2 [[5] τέκνα θεοῦ; German: "children of God."—M.]
[[6] German "and it hath not yet become manifest." Lillie: "A Passive verb with or without an adjective, is employed by Syr.; Dutch, Italian verss.; Aug. Beza, Hammond, Pearson, Berleb. Bible, Bengel," and many others. He himself renders: "and it hath not yet been manifested;" the German seeks to retain the Aorist in preference to the Perfect, but it is difficult to do so in idiomatic English.—M.]
[7] G. K. insert δὲ after οἴδαμεν. [A. B. C. Sin. al. omit it; the insertion may be readily accounted for by the apparent contrast with the preceding. The German omits δὲ and begins a new sentence thus: "*We know* etc."—M.]
[[8] φανερωθῇ, German: "when *it* shall be manifest;" Lillie: "when it shall be manifested" and in paraphrase: "when the mystery of our future being is unveiled, this is what shall be disclosed: '*we shall be like Him*,' whatever of glory and blessedness that involves.—M.]
[[9] German "*because*."—M.]

Verse 3 [[10] German "*on Him*" in lieu of the ambiguous and deceptive "*in him*" of E. V.—M.]
[[11] German: "halloweth himself even as He is holy."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Origin of the adoption.[1] v. 1*a*.

VER. 1*a*. **Behold!**—John desires to call the attention of his readers to their filial state, (Mark xiii. 1; Jno. i. 29), not without his own amazement at its glory, whereof, he himself, as a child of God, had made experience and therefore he uses in the sequel ἡμῖν not ὑμῖν. The former (noted only by Augustine, Sander and Huther) should be combined with the latter (to which Lyra and Grotius call attention), so that the right view lies not midway between these two thoughts (Düsterdieck), but in their combination.

What manner of love the Father hath given to us.—Ποταπός, of frequent occurrence in the New Testament, and (according to Buttmann, Lexicog. 125, 302) probably derived from ποῦ, πόθεν, and ἀπό (πο-απός) with an inserted δ (*pro-d-ire, pro-d-esse*), and properly ought to be

[1] Would it not be well to coin the word *child-ship* after the analogy of son-ship, fellow-ship, friend-ship, etc.? The word rendered "adoption" denotes "*childship*," and for the want of such a word in English the terms "sonship"—"adoption" have been used for the German "Kindschaft."—M.]

written ποδαπός, as it used to be written formerly, denotes literally *wherefrom? whence? cujas?* The question relates to extraction and race. Descent and quality are inquired after. So Luke i. 29: ποταπὸς εἴη ὁ ἀσπασμός; Matth. viii. 27: ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος. Descent and extraction are wholly lost sight of and there remains nothing but kind and quality. Luke vii. 39; 2 Pet. iii. 11; Mark xiii. 1. In the last passage the word slightly touches the sense of *quantus*. Hence it is wrong to translate "*qualem et quantum amorem*" (Socinus, Episcopius, Estius), what or "how great love" (Lücke, de Wette, Sander, Ewald) although we may admit that the signification of "*qualis*" plays into that of "*quantus*" (S. Schmidt, Düsterdieck, Huther).—Luther renders very well: "*what glorious, sublime love!*" The quality has, at any rate, to be retained. The fact, however, of its being undeserved is not implied in ποταπήν (Calvin), but rather in ἡμῖν, *indignis, inimicis, peccatoribus* (a Lapide), just as the ἀγάπη and its nature involves the idea of its greatness, even as the strength and greatness, the intensiveness and extensiveness of love are concentrated in Jno. iii. 16: οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεός. Luther pertinently observes in his Scholia: "*Usus est Johannes singulari verborum pondere: non dicit, dedisse nobis deum donum aliquod, sed ipsam caritatem et fontem omnium bonorum, cor ipsum, idque non pro operibus aut studiis nostris, sed gratuito.*" Ἀγάπη does not mean *caritatis munus* (Beza), *effectus, documentum, beneficium*, token or proof of love (Socinus, Episcopius, Grotius, Spener, Neander, al.); this is occasioned by δέδωκεν. Bengel: "*non modo destinavit et contulit, sed etiam exhibuit.*" God has not only given in love, but He has given love itself, made it our own, absolutely given it to us so that His love is now ours. [a Lapide explains ἀγάπην in the R. C. interest, thus: "*i. e. charitatem tum activam (actum amoris Dei quo nos mire amat), tum passivam nobisque a Deo communicatam et infusam. Videte quantum charitatem—nobis—præstitit et exhibuit Deus, cum—charitatem creatam nobis dedit, et infudit, quia filii Dei nominamur et sumus.*" Calvin's turn lies hardly in the Apostle's expression: "*Quod dicit* DATAM *esse caritatem, significat: hoc meræ esse liberalitatis, quod nos Deus pro filiis habet.*"—M.]. The Apostle, writing from a sense and consciousness of the adoption, says ὁ πατήρ and thus points to the sequel.

That we should be called children of God.—As we have not ὅτι as in Matth. viii. 27, the reference is not merely to the substance, the standing fact that we are called God's children (in opposition to S. Schmidt, Episcopius, al.); as we have not ὅπως, as in Jno. xi. 57, the reference is not purely telic, as maintained by Lange, Lücke, de Wette, Brückner, Neander, al., who are compelled to specify as the gift of love something which is not contained in the text, *e. g.* that of God sending the Son in order to indicate the purpose of our sonship. But being God's children is not a gift shortly to be communicated, not simply a present fact, but a task and problem, a fact only in process of becoming, only gradually accomplishing, not a creation of instantaneous occurrence or an immediately finished act of creation, but a work of God passing through different stages of development, and a history of man, a life wrought by God in man from a beginning to a high end, like the forgiveness of sins. Hence here, as in ch. i. 9, ἵνα signifies=that we *should* be called. Our adoption by the Father is the substance and aim of His love.—Καλεῖσθαι (Jno. ii. 23: φίλος θεοῦ ἐκλήθη does not denote a predicate without substance, a name without a meaning or an empty title, for He that calls us children is God, and the blessed and glorious spirits in heaven. Then we are called so by men, by the brethren in earnest, by the world in mockery. "Where God gives names, He always gives also the being [the thing signified by the name M.]." Besser.—We have not the name of children without the sonship, even as we do not only *call* God Father; He *is* also our Father. But the acknowledgment of this sonship given by God and exhibited in the life, is here brought out. Although Augustine is wrong ("*hic non est discrimen inter dici et esse*"), yet is Calvin right ("*inanis titulus esse non potest*"). Hence the Greek commentators explain: εἰδέτε γὰρ ὅτι ἐδωκεν ἡμῖν τέκνα αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι τε καὶ κληθῆναι (Oecumenius), or καὶ λογισθῆναι (Theophyl.).—Baumgarten-Crusius and Neander after him, explains καλεῖσθαι with reference to Jno. i. 12, by ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν γενέσθαι, but this is only the presupposition of καλεῖσθαι and it is not said that *we* should have the right to call ourselves children.—The position τέκνα θεοῦ indicates the notion of the sonship, the choice of the word τέκνα instead of υἱοί the beginning, the birth, the dependence, and the Genitive θεοῦ instead of αὐτοῦ the glory and highness of this sonship. Bengel: "*Quid majus, quam Deus? quæ proprior necessitudo, quam filius?*"

And we are!—This adjunction, externally testified and internally required, is neither a gloss nor governed by ἵνα (Vulgate "*et simus*") but an independent sentence designed to give special prominence and testimony to the reality of the sonship and the essence of the name; it is the gladsome expression of the certainty and of the consciousness founded on experience respecting this gift, although not exactly a triumphant exclamation over a hostile world. The assumption of Ebrard that κληθῶμεν indicates the relation of God to us and ἐσμὲν our relation to God, the former the fact of His being reconciled, the latter that of our changed nature and renovation, is unfounded. Both, indeed, are implied but not thus separated and distributed.

Antithesis of the Sonship v. 1b.

Therefore the world knoweth us not.—Διὰ τοῦτο refers back to what goes before: Because we are the children of God, the world knoweth us not. The Apostle mentions a necessary consequence of our being children of God, viz.: the world knoweth us not. He desires neither to meet an objection of believers (S. Schmidt), nor to express a ground of consolation [with respect to the persecutions to which they are exposed on the part of the world M.] (Luther, Grotius, de Wette, Lücke al.), but to adjoin an ever-recurring truth of our experience [I should prefer to say with Huther that the Apostle here describes the contrast between believers, τέκνα θεοῦ, and the world and the greatness of the love of the Father who gave them that endearing name. M.]. Ἡμᾶς denotes the relation and attitude, the nature and walk of the children of God, not

external personality or relation.—On ὁ κόσμος compare notes on ch. ii. 15, and on γινώσκειν notes on ch. ii. 3.—"The essence of the notion ὁ κόσμος according to John's manner of thinking is antagonism to God; this,—and not the consideration of the numerical strength and influence of those who were opposed to the few and obscure Christians, and without being properly godless were wont to judge every thing by the standard of worldly wisdom (Episcopius),—is the basis of the Apostle's argument." (Düsterdieck). γινώσκειν signifies a knowing which moves the whole man, rests on personal experience, voluntary agreement and lively interest, and agrees with the frame of mind, and the bias of life. The world does not understand Christians, seeks no intercourse with them, takes no part with them, or stands by them, and has no liking for them: all this is involved in οὐ γινώσκειν and signifies: does not know them [thoroughly or experimentally; the world has no conception of the spiritual nature of Christians.—M.]. Cf. v. 13; Jno. xvi. 33; xv. 20, 21. Hence the explanations of Grotius "*non agnoscit pro suis,*" Semler "*rejicit, reprobat,*" Baumgarten-Crusius and others=μισεῖ, are wrong. This relation subsisting between an ungodly world and the children of God the Apostle further explains in the following proposition:

Because it knew Him not.—Ὅτι does not depend on διὰ τοῦτο; John's purpose is to explain how it happens that the world does not understand the Christians, because they are children of God, and he observes accordingly that the fault lies not with the children of God, but it is the fault of the world itself, because it has not known God. Γινώσκειν of course must be taken here in the same sense as in the former clause and, neither=*credere in Deum* (S. Schmidt), nor=*nôsse doctrinam, curare divinam legem, jussa Dei observare* (Episcopius), but "the whole contrast in mind and bias, also hatred and persecution" (de Wette) are embraced in the world's not knowing God, both with reference to the children of God and to God Himself. The conclusion is valid: οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν υἱοθετήσαντα (Oecumenius), therefore οὐ γινώσκει τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ. Hence αὐτόν must designate God and not Christ. Because we are born of God, and have been made partakers of the Divine nature, the world knoweth not us, which did not know God.—The change of tense in γινώσκει and ἔγνω must not be overlooked. The fact of the world not knowing the children of God is conditioned by the fact of its not knowing God. This is the first, on which depends the second. The knowledge of God is the ground of the knowledge of man and the knowledge of the world, which are not wanting in the children of God; self-knowledge also depends on it. All these are wanting where the knowledge of God is wanting; there is wanting the knowledge and understanding of believers and personal knowledge with respect to the whole and the general to which people belong, and with respect to the particular, even down to their own heart and nature. They know nothing, not even, what they do (Luke xxiii. 34).

The hope of the Sonship. v. 2.

Ver. 2. **Beloved.**—This address, ἀγαπητοί, denotes a relation in which love is experienced, and in the present case experience of the love of God, whose children they are, and of the love of those with whom they are connected, and accordingly constitutes an antithesis to the preceding clause: We are children of God and therefore the world knoweth us not.

Now are we children of God.—The former ἐσμέν culminates in τέκνα θεοῦ and the preceding particle νῦν and is repeated after the parenthetical antithesis pointing first to the fact that the world does not know the children of God now, and secondly to the future. The context and position of νῦν require it to be taken as a particle of time (in opposition to de Wette: now, pursuant to that purpose of love). Thus it is emphatically asserted, that, notwithstanding the opposition of the world, we are already the children of God, although the glory of our sonship is still concealed and imperfect. So Lücke and Düsterdieck against Huther [who denies a reference to the preceding verse and considers νῦν used with respect to the future (οὔπω) to indicate the present glory of the children of God; adding that the Apostle before mentioning the future glory, notices the fact that it is as yet concealed.—M.].

And it hath not yet been manifested what we shall be.—Antitheses to the preceding are νῦν and οὔπω, ἐσμέν and ἐσόμεθα, τέκνα θεοῦ and τί, which is further answered by ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ, just as οὔπω ἐφανερώθη is carried further in ἐὰν φανερωθῇ and οἴδαμεν continued in ὀψόμεθα. These antitheses, however, are not *contraria*, but developments of the present τέκνα θεοῦ ἐσμέν, the development of the adoption into the inheritance. The argument therefore is properly carried on by καί (in opposition to Beza, Grotius, Spener and others, who construe καί as a Hebraism in the sense of ἀλλά), and δέ after οἴδαμεν is rightly wanting (contrary to S. Schmidt, Lücke, Sander and others).—Οὔπω ἐφανερώθη points to something actually existing but as yet concealed. For φανεροῦν means to make manifest, to bring to light, so as to be open to sight and to be known; not from the word itself, but from the context it has to be determined whether this manifestation is to take place factually, by means of historical development and events, or logically by means of instruction and teaching; here the former course is very distinctly marked (so Huther in opposition to Ebrard) so also ch. ii. 19; Jno. ii. 11; vii. 4; xvii. 6; xxi. 1. The context in like manner implies to *whom* this manifestation is to be made, if it is not explicitly stated. The primary reference is here probably to the world, the secondary to believers (Düsterdieck). The interrogative (τί ἐσόμεθα) presents no difficulty, and contains nothing to favour Ebrard's opinion, since not only after verbs of knowing, inquiring etc., and in *direct* questions, but also in cases where classical writers would certainly have used ὅ, τι, the N. T. writers use the interrogative pronoun; cf. Winer p. 181; Buttmann p. 216. On the thought itself compare Col. iii. 3 (ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ) Rom. viii. 17 (εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι—θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ) and v. 18 (οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς), also Gal. iv. 1 (ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νήπιός ἐστι, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου κύριος πάντων ὤν.)

It is important to remember that what is said is: "it has not yet appeared what we shall be" and not, that "we shall be something which as yet we are not": οὔπω negatives not the being, but the having appeared, the being manifested. There is only *one* Divine sonship (child-ship); *non dantur gradus υἱότητος* (Calov). But it has its *status* or stages, its unfolding and development, the development of the inner being of a child of God and the unfolding of their manifold privileges and possessions. "The future already exists in the germ and is latent in the present" (Düsterdieck). Augustine: "*Quid est ergo, quod jam expectamus, si jam filii Dei sumus? quid autem erimus aliud, quam filii Dei?*" However different the future state may be from the present and although we must distinguish the one from the other, the former is not absolutely *new* [Huther—M.]. This is the force of οὔπω ἐφανερώθη, which only brings out and opens to sight that which is concealed, and this is the ἐσμέν become ἐσόμεθα. [Oecumenius: τὸ γὰρ νῦν ἄδηλον φανερὸν γενήσεται, ἐκείνου ἀποκαλυπτομένου. ὅμοιοι γὰρ αὐτῷ ἀναφανέντες τὸ τῆς υἱοθεσίας λαμπρὸν παραστήσομεν. οἱ γὰρ υἱοὶ πάντες ὅμοιοι τῷ πατρί.—M.]. But what does that consist in?

We know that when it shall be manifested, we shall be like (similar to) **Him.**—Οἴδαμεν signifies certainty of knowing, not only guess-knowledge (Jachmann), and knowing participated in not only by the Apostles (Episcopius), but by all Christians (Calvin), by all of whom it is said: τέκνα θεοῦ ἐσμέν. The object of that knowing is: ὅτι ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα. The occurrence of this future condition is indicated by ἐὰν φανερωθῇ. As we have ἐὰν and not ὅταν the reference is not only to the time when (Socinus and al.), but to the reality of the matter, cf. notes on ch. ii. 28. Also Jno. xii. 32; xiv. 3; xvi. 7. The Vulgate gives the precise shade of thought: *cum apparuerit*, bringing out the force of the *Fut. exact.* applied in the *Subj. Aorist*. The subject of φανερωθῇ is τί ἐσόμεθα, which is clear from the unmistakable reference to ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα. No expositor has seriously thought of *God*, but several supply *Christ* (Augustine, Bede, Calvin, Calov and others.).—Φανεροῦσθαι τί ἐσόμεθα coincides with the coming of Christ and *quoad rem*, it is very possible to think here of Christ. But φανεροῦν would then have to be explained here of His appearing in glory, whereas it is used in v. 5 of His appearing in the flesh and expressly referred to Him by the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος, and the same verb had different subjects in the two sentences immediately succeeding each other. We may admit here "the possibility of that reference, the reality of which" is stated in v. 5, but have to maintain with the greater number of expositors that the concinnity of the diction requires us to supply to φανερωθῇ the same subject which belongs to ἐφανερώθη, namely τί ἐσόμεθα, especially since the latter is explained by ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα; the latter two as well as the two forms of φανεροῦσθαι are correlatives. Oecumenius excellently remarks: τὸ γὰρ νῦν ἄδηλον φανερὸν γενήσεται, ἐκείνου ἀποκαλυπτομένου· ὅμοιοι γὰρ αὐτῷ ἀναφανέντες τὸ τῆς υἱοθεσίας λαμπρὸν παραστήσομεν. οἱ γὰρ υἱοὶ πάντως ὅμοιοι τῷ πάτρι.—Ὅμοιος is resembling, similar to and not=equal to (Sander); it is not=ἴσος [the English "*like*" is ambiguous signifying both "*similar*" and "*equal*." I have retained "*like*" in the text, but given "*similar*" in brackets.—M.]. Of Christ Paul says: τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ Phil. ii. 6; and His enemies: ἴσον τῷ θεῷ, Jno. v. 18. Luke calls υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ—ἰσάγγελοι but not ἴσοι θεῷ.—Recollect the controversy of ὁμοούσιον and ὁμοιούσιον.—Ὅμοιος signifies similarity in external form and appearance (ὁράσει, Rev. iv. 3; cf. i. 13, 15; ix. 7, 10, 19), and then in kind and authority (Jno. viii. 55; Rev. xiii. 4; xviii. 18). It is certain that "the creature will never become Creator" (Luther I), and "*Non erimus idem, quod Deus, sed similes erimus Dei*" (Luther, Schol.). That the connection requires us to to apply αὐτῷ to God and not to Christ, is clear and almost universally acknowledged; hence Bengel says very pointedly: "*Deo, cujus sumus filii.*" Now although the notion of resemblance to God is somewhat vague, the question arises whether the context does not shed light on the subject. Huther indeed rightly observes that commentators are not warranted in *arbitrarily* restricting it, but the attempt of deriving more light from the context must not be absolutely repudiated. Much will depend on the right understanding of the adjoined sentence.

Because we shall see Him as He is.—The annexation by ὅτι points to a *casual* relation of resemblance to God and seeing God. This is almost universally acknowledged. Hence it is wrong to take ὅτι=ἀλλὰ καὶ (Oecumenius), or=ὅτε καὶ (Scholiast. II.), or=*et* (Luther, *Schol.*), for this disturbs and negatives the internal relation of the two. Nor does ὅτι describe the "*Modus hujus transformationis*" (Lyra). It is most natural to take the internal relation of resemblance to God and seeing God, so that the *cause* of resemblance to God lies in seeing God: we shall be similar to God, because we shall see Him face to face. For grammatically and dialectically this course is pointed out to us. We shall be similar to Him, because we shall see Him, says the Apostle, and not: ὀψόμεθα αὐτὸν, ὅτι ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα (Düsterdieck). The resemblance to God is the end of the love of God, and not the seeing God which is simply the instrument of the former. Cf. Jno. xvii. 24. As γινώσκειν conduces to having (ἔχειν), so seeing God effects the being, and more particularly the being similar to Him. Hence the internal relation of the two is reversed if ὅτι is supposed to add only a "*testimonium aut signum similitudinis*" (Carpzov), not the cause of it, or if the seeing God is taken as the effect, from which is inferred the cause, resemblance of God (Calvin, Socinus, Episcopius, Rickli). Nor may we infer with Huther that because we *shall* see Him, therefore we know *now* (οἴδαμεν) that we shall be similar to Him; particularly as that knowledge rests on the sonship, which is a fact, and the word of promise given to the children of God. But this seeing must be taken in the full acceptation of the word, a real perfect seeing in the resurrection-body, and not only a real knowing The believer is in the σῶμα πνευματικόν (1 Cor. xv. 44) and sees face to face (1 Cor. xiii. 12); it is "*maxime practica visio, summi boni αἴσθησις plenissima*" (J. Lange).—The object of this seeing is God, καθώς ἐστι: "As He is not only in His Image etc., but in Himself and in His Being, His perfect

majesty and glory (Spener). Such a seeing of God is a real ground of resembling God according to Rev. xxii. 4: καὶ ὄψονται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν. 2 Cor. iii. 18: ἡμεῖς—ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος. Hence Bengel: "*ex aspectu similitudo.*" Spener: "The seeing is the cause of the likeness." So likewise de Wette, Neander, Düsterdieck, Ebrard. The seeing God must react on him who sees by glorifying him into that which is the object of his seeing, making him similar to Him whom he sees. Thus is fulfilled the promise that we shall be θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (2 Pet. i. 4). Hence we must not think with Ebrard of "the light-nature of God," or with de Wette of "the δόξα of God," and still less with S. Schmidt and Düsterdieck only of ch. ii. 29: δικαιός ἐστιν, but rather with the Greek expositors (συμβασιλεύσομεν καὶ συνδοξασθήσομεν αὐτῷ) also of our joint inheritance with Christ, since ch. ii. 28 (cf. Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12) suggests as much, and we may say with Luther that we have become lords of sin, of death and the devil. But although Calov clearly passes the bounds of exegesis in his dogmatical thought ("*ratione mentis sapientia, ratione voluntatis sanctitate et justitia, ratione corporis immortalitate, ratione utriusque gloria et felicitate æterna deo similes erimus*"), those who are held fast in the enlightenment of the understanding by no means do justice to the text; and of these men Oertel caps the climax in his philosophical exposition: "I believe that the reference here is simply to the higher perfection of the knowledge of the Christian religion and the sense to be as follows: Some day, after several generations and centuries, mankind, which as yet clings overmuch to the spirit of coarseness, will be more enlightened, ennobled and happy and thus by means of the more perfect light that is to rise, attain to a perfect knowledge of the plan of God and the purpose of Jesus.—Ah, John, if thou hadst had a presentiment of the bloody Nicæades, Costnitziades, Dragoonades, edicts, etc. and the times when thousands were slaughtered in honour of religion!—But—thy presentiment of the education of mankind in religion, virtue and philanthropy will yet be perfected by the Providence of the Almighty Father." [Augustine (*Tract. in Ep. Jno.* iv. 5) who however understands αὐτῷ and αὐτόν of Christ, exclaims: "*Ergo visuri sumus quandam visionem, fratres, quam nec oculus vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit: visionem quandam, visionem præcellentem omnes pulchritudines terrenas, auri, argenti, nemorum atque camporum, pulchritudinem maris et aëris, pulchritudinem solis et lunæ, pulchritudinem angelorum, omnia superantem, quia ex ipsa pulchra sunt omnia.*"—M.].

The power of this hope. v. 8.

VER. 8. **And every one that hath this hope on Him, halloweth himself.**—With καὶ which is not=οὖν, John annexes the sentence expressing "the moral effect of Christian hope" (Huther), which although it contains an exhortation in point of sense, yet formally expresses it as a fact and that more emphatically, since it intimates in decided terms that he who does not hallow himself, surrenders that hope in ingratitude. For πᾶς ὁ ἔχων is *omnis et solus;* "Every one—and only such an one; for as this hope (v. 2) peculiarly and exclusively belongs to the children of God, they and they only enjoy the power of such a hope whether it is to exhibit itself in sanctification, as here, or to afford patience and joyfulness (Rom. viii. 14 sqq.; 23 sqq.)" (Düsterdieck), and ἐπ' αὐτῷ *i. e.* θεῷ denotes "the fulcrum" (Huther), or still better "the real foundation of this hope" (J. Lange), the ground and soil out of which it grows up, so that S. Schmidt rightly observes: "*Deus gignit spem.*" Grotius weakens the thought: "*Sicut Deus eam spem vult concipi.*" Besides ἐλπίζειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ (*God*) occurs Rom. xv. 12 and ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ θεῷ 2 Tim. vi. 17, although ἔχειν ἐλπίδα ἐπὶ *cum dat.*, occurs only here and with εἰς θεὸν Acts xxiv. 15.—Ὁ ἔχων τὴν ἐλπίδα is not the same as ὁ ἐλπίζων, the latter denoting only the act of hope, but the former describing hope as a permanent property, as a fixed possession, so that the act of hoping is uninterrupted and lasting. Hence it is neither necessary nor correct to explain ἔχειν, as holding fast or preserving (Benson, Spener), or to take here ἐλπίδα as the object of hope, that which one is objectively entitled to hope (Ebrard). Τὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην naturally leads us to think of ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα. This was v. 2 the object and substance of οἴδαμεν. Now it is designated by ἔχειν τὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην ἐπ' αὐτῷ as the object of a yearning desire in the power of God, in order to bring out the purifying reaction in our earthly life. The mere ἐλπίζειν would be incongruous with the ἁγνίζειν ἑαυτὸν, which is affected and to be effected. Primarily, however, this hope and self-sanctification only are here connected (Hofmann), but the state of having hope and participation in this hope are presupposed in the case of the acts of such sanctifying of oneself. "*Qui habet hanc spem et credit, se esse filium Dei, et expectat donec fides sua reveletur, is sine dubio ita accendetur spe illa, ut se purificet, nec involvat se sordibus carnis, sed carnem mortificabit*" (Luther). Self-sanctification necessarily combined with Christian hope (de Wette) is its *effectus* (Hunnius). Hope is the mother of sanctification, not the reverse, as Grotius maintains. Nor is sanctification the condition of the fulfilment of this hope (Lücke and several Roman Catholic commentators), nor must we find here the combination of both views (Schlichting, Episcopius). Ἁγνίζειν from ἁγνός=καθαρός (Suidas), טָהוֹר (Numb. viii. 21; vi. 2, 8; Ps. xi. 7) clean, pure; applied in the New Testament to wisdom (Jas. iii. 47), to one fulfilling a vow (Acts xxi. 24, 26; xxiv. 18), to the Christian walk (1 Pet. i. 22; Jas. iv. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 22), and to the chaste (Tit. ii. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 12; v. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 2). It signifies accordingly ἐλευθερία παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος (Phavorinus), ἡ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀποχή (Clement. Alex.). Hence it is the opposite of *impure*, and ἅγιος the opposite of *profane*, although the latter denotes inward impurity and the former outward profanity [pollution] as a consequence and in a secondary sense. The reference to God, who is δίκαιος and whom we are to resemble, necessitates us not to restrict the

meaning of ἁγνίζειν to *castificare* (Augustine), but to take it in a wider sense like καθαρίζειν (ch. i. 7, 9.). "*Hoc non tantum de illa turpitudine carnis intelligendum est, sed de omnibus passionibus animi vitiosis, ira, avaritia, invidia, odio, superbia, gloriæ cupididate etc.*" (Luther). The object of this hallowing is ἑαυτὸν, that is to say our own self, and not only particular details of our life or our outward life. The exhortations of Peter (2 Pet. iii. 13, 14) and Paul (2 Cor. vii. 1) are analogous in point of matter. The Present denotes uninterrupted self-purification (Beza, Spener, Grotius, al.), because the Divine life in us constantly encounters impurity and unrighteousness and because these must be done away (Düsterdieck). But this self-purification does not proceed from our own self in the same manner as it bears upon it; hence there is no αὐτὸς by the side of ἑαυτόν. Augustine pointedly says in this respect: "*Quis non castificat nisi Deus? Sed Deus te nolentem non castificat. Ergo quod adjungis voluntatem tuam Deo, castificas te ipsum. Castificas te, non* de te, *sed* de illo, *qui venit, ut habitet in te. Tamen quia agis ibi aliquid voluntate, ideo et tibi aliquid tributum est.*" The power, the impulse and initiative of self-purification do not reside in the *liberum arbitrium* of man, but in that on which rests the hope which impels self-purification. [See Huther.—M.].

Even as He is holy.—Ἐκεῖνος is Christ, according to the constant use of that word in juxtaposition with αὐτὸς, in the writings of John. Cf. ch. ii. 6. While the context required us to apply αὐτὸς to God, ἐκεῖνος may and must be applied to Christ, as the more remote subject. We cannot refer both to Christ (Aretius, Estius, Calvin), or both to God (Lyra, Socinus, al.). Christ is the pattern, and expressly shows us how we may become similar to God. If the Apostle had said only: καθὼς ἐκεῖνος, we should then have been obliged to supply ἁγνίζειν. This is impossible, and the Apostle therefore adjoins ἁγνός ἐστι; purity belongs to Him essentially, He is absolutely and originally holy and righteous, "in most perfect harmony with the original righteousness as well as the original purity of the Father" (Düsterdieck) see vv. 5, 7, ch. ii. 1. "The ἁγνότης is an attribute inhering in Christ" (Lücke), and ἐστι, not: ἦν, indicates an uninterrupted and permanent condition (Jno. i. 18). There is no reason why καθὼς should be explained by *quandoquidem* and the purity of Christ should be construed into a second motive of self-purification (as Ebrard does). Even the externally direct relation to Christ is sufficiently manifest to the specifically Christian way of thinking, in virtue of the position of Christ as our only and eternal Mediator, and indispensable to John's manner of contemplation; the immutable state of Christ is the perfect standard of Christians, and not only an outward example set before us, but a vital power. Cf. i. 1; ii. 1, 6; iii. 5, 7, 16; iv. 17; [that is: the purity of Christ is the immutable and perfect standard and pattern according to which Christians should shape and mould their whole life, not only outwardly in acts, but inwardly in the disposition of the heart and the determination of the will.—M.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The state of our being the children of God is a gift of the preëminent love of God; this is a point to be insisted upon in opposition to Pelagius and all Pelagian errors. A chaste exegesis requires us not to go beyond this general character of this passage and neither to beat (with Calvin) with it "*the sophists*" who postulate the foreseen future dignity of those whom God adopts, nor to find here the Lutheran principle "*regeneratio præcedit fidem,*" while the (German) Reformed hold: "*fides præcedit regenerationem.*" Here is simply the assertion of the prevenient love of the Father as the cause of our adoption, as in ch. iv. 10.

2. But not only from God, but from God only, from God exclusively proceedeth all the divine life, which passes before him. Our life of faith takes us back to Him, the Father, whose Nature is love.

3. Christianity brings not new information but a new life, not a new doctrine but a new nature, which like the natural, bodily birth has however its growth and development from the hidden, germ-like beginning to the most glorious perfection.

4. The world with all its glory does neither understand the kingdom of God nor the people and history of this kingdom; here is the ground and beginning of all enmity against the Church of Jesus and Christian Church-ordinances (Luke xxiii. 34). Our Lord's prayer: ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ—Jno. xvii. 21, does not contradict the language of John. Christ adverts to the means designed to break through the mind and hardness of the world, while John here bears testimony to the mind and hardness of the world without intending to exclude that they may and should be counteracted and that not in vain.

5. But the first thing the world ought to be helped to get is that it may know God and the Divine. The knowledge of God, which however is only excited under the influence and manifestations of His love, conditions the knowledge of His people and kingdom.

6. The adoption of God has a history from its first beginning to its perfected glorification in the likeness of God, which takes place in consequence of the perfect vision of God, the seeing God effecting the transformation into the Image of God.

7. That which one day will become perfect in seeing God must begin here on earth in faith, and the glorification into the Image of God has its beginning in the sanctification wrought on earth. But this does by no means put the *sanctificatio* in the power of man. For first it does not go before the *justificatio* (as is assumed by Roman Catholics) and secondly it has respect only to those who are born of God and takes place only by means of the power conveyed and appropriated in regeneration; consequently although it takes place with our own power, yet is this power not originally our own but only bestowed by the grace of God and made our own in faith, so that Wolf is perfectly right in saying: "*aliud est δικαιοῦν,*

aliud ἁγνίζειν, prius illud in hominem non cadit,—ut vero posterius." Compare the quotation from Augustine in *Exegetical* and *Critical* on v. 3.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Two wonderful things: 1. The love of God which desires to adopt us as children; 2. The perverseness of the world which does not know such a Lord.—Art thou more astonished at God's loving attitude to the world, or at the world's hateful attitude to God and His children? Dost thou think it more strange that God treats thee as a child than that the world does not and will not understand thee? Dost thou not see that it is more natural and reasonable that the world is against thee than that God is for thee?—See that thou find thy way through all the proofs of the love of God even to that of His adoption of thee and through all the enmity of the world even to the knowledge of its ignorance and want of understanding! He only that does the former is able to do the latter.—Think of thy own and thy children's adoption by God and inquire even in the case of one who is distasteful to thee, whether he is not as well as thou a child of God, and perhaps better entitled to be one than thou art thyself. This is very important and profitable for one's own discipline, the education of one's children and one's intercourse with and among men.—Hope for the future, but do not expect to reap hereafter without sowing now; wouldst thou hereafter see God and become like Him it is necessary for thee to begin here to purify thyself by strenuous application.—Thy adoption rests on the foundation of God's eternal love, reaches even into God's eternal felicity, but in this temporal present and the present transitoriness it may be lost and therefore must be preserved all the infirmity of thy own flesh and all the enmity of the world notwithstanding.—Happy is the man whose joy flows from the grateful love of God and whose troubles proceed from a hostile world, but woe to him, whose joy is from beneath and whose troubles come from above, who is the friend of the world and the enemy of God, because he will not be His child.—At peace with God and at war with the world is a wholesome foundation for the alternatives of joy and trouble in thy life.—The import of our adoption by God: 1. Its *Origin*—the love of God. 2. Its *Opposite*—an ignorant world without understanding. 3. Its *hope*—blessed likeness to God. 4. Its *power*—the zeal of self-purification.—Vital questions and answers for the guidance of life. 1. Who is for thee? God in His eternal love. 2. Who is against thee? The world in its short-sightedness. 3. Whence? From God. 4. Whither? To God's glory. 5. How? In the work of sanctification.

Clemens Romanus:—How blessed and how wonderful are the gifts of God! Life in immortality, splendour in righteousness, truth in joy, faith in confidence, chastity in holiness—all these are goods present to our mind.

Chrysostom:—Those who depise and deride us, know not who we are, citizens of heaven, belonging to an eternal fatherland, associates of the Cherubim; but they will know it in the day of judgment when they will exclaim with sighs and amazement, these are they whom we used to despise and deride.

[Cassiodorus:—Let us therefore so live, that when He shall come again, we may be able to behold Him, as He is, in all the fulness of His grace and glory.—M.]

Augustine:—The whole life of a Christian is a holy longing. What we long for, we do not yet see; but by longing thou art enlarging thyself so that when it is visible, thou mayest be filled therewith.—It is God alone who purifies us; but He does not purify thee, thyself unwilling; thou purifiest thyself, but not of thyself, but of Him [de Illo] who comes to dwell in thee.

Luther:—If God were strictly to reckon with us, He would owe us nothing but hell; but if He gives us heaven, it is of grace.

Starke:—Dost thou bear here the image of the devil and thinkest to become like Christ there? O, folly! O, deceit! Without the renovation of the divine Image none can attain to the glory of God.—Without purification hope of the future glory is impossible. The hope of the impure is daring, impudence and insolence.—Our Christianity is not so much a being pure as a continuous purifying oneself.—Believers purify not only one thing or another, but themselves, wholly, body and soul. The main work lies within and in the soul.—O, the shameful abuse of the Gospel! to be ever appealing to Christ and His merits, and yet never to follow His example!

Daniel:—Christian, whose is the best nobility? His, who is born of God. Who is the most honoured man? He whom God regards in grace.—A missionary in India (Ziegenbalg) is translating the New Testament with the assistance of a native. Coming to this verse the Hindoo youth translates: that we may be allowed to kiss his feet. The missionary asks: Why do you render thus? The Indian replies: A child! that is too much! too high!—That had never entered into a heathen's heart.

Steinhofer:—A child of God is always an enigma to the world.

Heubner:—The children of God bear the image, the glory of the Father, enjoy his whole fatherly love and are destined to own what He owns. All this God bestows upon us, apostates and former enemies. Every one is asked to become such a child.—The Christians should have *called* themselves the children of God? 'Twere pitiable indeed, if they did assume this title and as it were raise themselves to the divine nobility, and worse than if a fool would presume to call himself baron or count. We should be called thus by God and the heavenly children of God; in the Bible the name and the thing are one; the Bible does not know empty trifles.—The sonship is nothing that dazzles the eye, fascinates and attracts in a worldly point of view; it is rather something that is hidden. The world has no eye for it; why? because it knows not God, whereas we see in God the highest and most glorious good, and deem that only glorious which comes from God.—The Christian is quiet, calm, courageous under all the want of appreciation he experiences at the hands of the world; it neither surprises nor disturbs him; being misunderstood by the world cannot injure him.—Christians are

the children of a prince, who are obliged to travel in lowly garb, incognito, and as it were in order to be tried, through a foreign country before they take possession of their kingdom. A secret, inward sense of his sonship accompanies the Christian on his journey through the world, through its busy noise; in his heart he walks with God—virtue is not to become a display and an ostentation, therefore the children of God have neither coat of arms nor the badge of an order. The future dignity of Christians cannot be guessed from his appearance any more than it could be determined from the appearance of Christ in His manger-cradle.—They are not condemned to eternal obscurity.—O day beyond compare when God will call His children, saying; Come forth from your obscurity, rise from your lowliness!—The promises of Christianity are transcendently glorious; Christians are not to be like the blessed, the perfected saints or the angels, but like God; what man could have laid hold of this daring hope without revelation?—The Christian should, as it were, keep himself up in a state of excitement. He is terrified at the thought: What? Shouldst thou exchange thy heavenly birthright for the world's mess of pottage? denounce thy faith and lose thy Christian rank for the lust of the flesh, mammon or worldly honour?—Sanctification, though it does not acquire salvation (for it is the gift of grace), yet preserves it. Purification continues day by day; we are often polluted.

Ebrard:—Our future glory is *not an object of curiosity*, not an object for inquisitiveness to be exercised about.—Not to purify oneself is tantamount to saying to God: "I do not want the jewel which thou holdest up before my eyes as the most precious jewel and promisest one day to give me: to be freed from sin I do not esteem a jewel."

Besser:—Says David as a Christian before Christ: "I am as a wonder unto many," Ps. lxxi. 7; much more are Christians after Christ the real children of wonder. The world, indeed, which *will* remain in the Wicked One, sees in the name of our sonship nothing but an empty, imaginary title.—Even though rejuvenated to the state of apostolical power and consecration the Church would yet have the world—although *against* her, yet not only *outside* of her (for bad fish also are found *in* the net), and woe to her, if she were ever to forget in the time of her militant state that her holiness is not perfected in those who are sanctified but only in Him who sanctifies them, and that in the administration of discipline over her members with which she is solemnly charged, she must use the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God for the condemnation of sin and the salvation of sinners, and not the winnowing shovel for cleaning the threshing-floor.—John, in particular, cherishes the most profound conviction that there is only *one* life for the children of God in time and in eternity, and he knows of no future happiness but that which, like the rose in the bud, is already contained germ-like in faith.—As the eye cannot endure the presence of the smallest particle of dust but sheds tears until it is clear again, so also the Christian's eye of hope eagerly looking forward to the coming glory will not tolerate the presence of a particle of the world's dust, and if any fly into it, it contracts with the keenest sensibility and the Lord gives tears of penitence which wash away the dust.—

Tholuck:—*How blessed is the lot of a believing disciple of the Saviour.*

1. *How blessed such a disciple is even now.* Who recognizes in mankind, as we see it, who recognizes in it a *family of God?* The heathen, when they saw how Christians were so intimately united in the bonds of so novel a life, exclaimed; "*See, how they love one another!*—Blissful joy and astonishment at one and the same time. A child-like mind cannot understand how and why it was thought worthy of so much grace and favour.

2. *How blessed he will be hereafter.* If you like, you may call it a defiance, but it is a divine defiance, as Luther says: "That faith gives man a *defiant* heart toward God and toward all creatures." But what is the centre of all the hope of these poor and miserable people? is it honour, glory, enjoyment? Certainly. Rom. ii. 7-10.

3. *Whereto that faith and this hope impel him.* It cannot be the centre of Christian longing and hope in the hour of death that we shall see again our loved ones, but its centre is rather that we shall see Him again. Does it well forth from a *weakly* sense, or from that *manly-strong sense*, that *seeing Him* and *to be like Him, freedom from sin and error*, are one and the same thing? Purify your faith, steel your hope in the faith and hope of the disciple whom you regard only too often as the preacher of a weakly, morbid love.—That resemblance will not fall to thy share *without thy own will.* Thou must feel within thee the *thirst* for it and ask and examine thyself with holy love, what is still unclean in me?—Compare the notes on vv. 4–10.

Biarowsky:—The Holy Communion a glorification of the Triune God: 1. in that the Triune God glorifies Himself in it; 2. in that we glorify thereby the Triune God.

Genzken (*Baptismal address*):—What a gift! what a task! what a blessed end even for this child.

[Burkitt:—*We shall be like him:* in holiness as well as in happiness; as well in purity as immortality.—M.]

[Secker:—To be "like God" implies in few words everything desirable, that ever so many words can express.—M.]

[Bp. Conybeare:—The state of good men in the other world will carry with it a resemblance not in degree, but in kind, to the absolutely perfect Being, in those perfections of which man is capable: and that these will be produced in us by "seeing God as He is;" that is, by a vastly more distinct and more full sight of Him, than the present condition of human nature will admit of.—M.]

[Macknight:—*And every man that hath this hope of* seeing Christ, and of being like Him "purifieth himself." The felicity, which the Gospel teacheth us to expect in the world to come, is not that of a Mohammedan paradise, in which animal pleasures are the chief enjoyments. The happiness of the children of God in the kingdom of their Father will consist in being like Christ, not only in respect of His immortality, but in respect of his transcendent virtues, especially His boundless benevolence. And the joy, which

will flow from the possession and exercise of virtues similar to Christ's is so great, that no one, who hopes to become like Christ in virtue and happiness, will indulge himself in the unrestrained enjoyment of sensual pleasures; but will purify himself from the immoderate desire of those pleasures, in imitation of the purity of Christ.—*Purifieth himself*, namely, from the lusts of the flesh and from every sin. The Apostle, as Beza has observed, does not say, "hath purified himself," but "purifieth himself," to show that it is a good man's constant study to purify himself, because in this life no one can attain unto perfect purity. By this text therefore, as well as by ch. i. 8, those fanatics are condemned, who imagine they are able to live without sin.—M.]

[HORSLEY:—Would God a better conformity to the example of his purity, than actually obtains, were to be found in the lives of nominal Christians! the numbers would be greater, which might entertain a reasonable hope that they shall be made like to Him when He appeareth. But thanks be to God, repentance, in this as in other cases, genuine, sincere repentance, shall stand the sinner in the stead of innocence: the sinner is allowed to wash the stains, even of these pollutions, in the Redeemer's blood.—M.]

[Compare also the thoughtful lecture of JOHN FOSTER on 1 Jno. iii. 2: "Our Ignorance of our Future Mode of Existence."—M.]

[EZ. HOPKINS:—*We shall see Him as He is:* we must not understand it as if we could ever arrive to such a capacity as to see and know God as He is in His Infinite Essence: for God's Essence being altogether indivisible, to know God essentially, were to know Him comprehensively; to know Him, as much as He is to be known in Himself; that is, to know Him as much as He knows Himself; which is impossible, for no finite understanding can comprehend an infinite object. And, yet, our sight and knowledge of God shall so far surmount those dim and glimmering discoveries which here He makes of Himself to us, that, comparatively, the Apostle might well call it, a seeing Him as He is, and a knowing Him as we are known by Him.—M.]

[On Chapter III. MANTON, T., Thirty-two Sermons. Works, 5, 577.

Ch. 3, 1. HIERONYMUS, S., The spiritual sonship. 2 Serm. Works, 849.

Vv. 1–3. STOUGHTON, JOHN. The dignitie of God's children: or an exposition of 1 Jno. iii, 1–3, plentifully shewing the comfortable, happie and most blessed state of all God's children, and also, on the contrarie, the base, fearfull, and most woful condition of all other that are not the children of God. 4to. London. 1610.

V. 2. TILLOTSON, ABP. Of the happiness of good men in a future state. 2 Sermons. Serm. 10, 56.

SAURIN, J. Heaven. Sermons 8, 321.

VENN, JOHN. The effect of seeing God as He is. Serm. 1, 210.

DWIGHT, T. Adoption. Theol. 3, 167

HAMILTON, R. W. The heavenly state. Congregat. Lecture, 235.

V. 3. SOUTH, R. The hope of future glory, an excitement to purity of life. Sermons 6, 441 (Epiph. 6). Hope of resembling Christ. Pitman, 2d course, L. 206.

ALFORD, H. The pure in heart. Hulsean Lecture, 1842. 41. M.]

---

3. *The way of God's children passes through God's Law.*

CHAPTER III. 4–10*a*.

4 Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law[1]: for sin[2] is the transgression of
5 the law[3]. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our[4] sins; and in him is no
6 sin[5]. Whosoever[6] abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever[7] sinneth hath not seen him,
7 neither known him. Little children[8], let no man deceive you[9]: he that doeth righteous-
8 ness is righteous, even as he is righteous. He that committeth[10] sin is of the devil; for
the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose[11] the Son of God was mani-
9 fested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever[12] is born of God
doth not commit sin; for[13] his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he
10 is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the
devil.

Verse 4 [1 German: "Every one that doeth (the) sin, doeth also (the) lawlessness."—M.]
2 ἡ ἁμαρτία A. B. C. G. K. al. Sin. The Article is very strongly supported and syntactically required.
[3 German: "And (the) sin is the lawlessness."—M.]
Verse 5 4 ἡμῶν, omitted in A. B. Vulg. al., is found in C. G. K. Sin. [Also the reading of Syr. Theophyl. Oecum. Bede, Lachm. Tischend. Buttmann.—M.]
[5 German: "That He (that One) was manifested to take away our sins and sin is not in Him."
Verse 6 [6 German: "Every one that."—M.]
[7 Same as 6.—M.]
Verse 7 8 παιδία A. C. al. τεκνία B. Sin. [Undecided which is the true reading.—M.]
[9 German: "Let no one seduce you."—M.]
Verse 8 [10 German: "He that doeth sin."—M.]
[11 German: "For this" (εἰς τοῦτο). No warrant for the additional "purpose" in E. V.—M.]
Verse 9 [12 Same as note 6. German: "Every one that is born (out) of God, doeth not sin."—M.]
[13 German: "Because."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection. The Apostle having traced the glory of the sonship up to the power (which it derives from hope in God) of working out self-purification, annexes v 4 with a more general antithesis which, as usual, contains a progression of the argument. The positive: "Every one that hath this hope purifieth himself;" is contrasted with the negative: "Every one that doeth sin, doeth lawlessness." He does not negatively resume the notion of the subject ("every one that hath this hope"), but that of the predicate ("purifieth himself"). However, by this annexation of the notion of the predicate he denies also, by implication, that such an one is the child and heir of God, and adds a new point, viz. such an one not only injures himself and his portion but he violates also the law and ordinance of God, at the same time, referring back to the leading thought in ch. ii. 29, since all doing of sin is repugnant to the righteousness of God revealed in the law (v. 4) and in Christ (vv. 5–7), and delineates rather the children of the devil (vv. 8–10), than the children of God, who, abiding in Christ, do righteousness and not sin (vv. 6, 9, 10).

The nature of sin. v. 4.

Ver. 4. **Every one that committeth sin, committeth also lawlessness.**—"The Apostle is anxious to show that the truth of the thought is unexceptionable." (Huther.)—The first point to be determined here is the notion ἁμαρτία. Suidas derives ἁμαρτία from μάρπτω to grasp, to seize, consequently=missing the mark (Rom. xxi. 8, 802, 811, 23, 62); then moral omission. Oecumenius: ἀποτυχεῖν σκοποῦ, ἡ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀπόπτωσις, on the other hand ἀνομία=ἡ περὶ τὸν θετὸν νόμον πλημμέλεια (πλὴν—μέλος contrary to the melody, a false note, an error). 'Αμαρτία, of course, is as much an opposition to the Divine righteousness (ἀδικία), as a departure from the Divine law, a violation of the same (ἀνομία), and this ἡ ἀνομία is here not only a not having the law (as ἄνομος 1 Cor. ix. 21 denotes one who has not a law), but signifies the refractoriness opposed to the law. Neither ἁμαρτία nor ἀνομία are qualified by anything which would narrow this their meaning, nor may such a qualification be added from the context. Although the Article distinctly takes sin in the sense of an *offence* [old English: *missing.* M.] towards *God,* and ἀνομία as an opposition to the *law of God,* and removes all indefinite generality, yet no qualification within this ethico-religious sphere is admissible. But we must not attach too much importance to this, since the Article is wanting in v. 9: ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖν and ποιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν and ἁμαρτάνειν (vv. 4, 6, 8, 9) are used *promiscue,* so that we must not attach too much importance to ποιεῖν. To this must be added that καὶ before τὴν ανομίαν conveys the idea that the doing of the ἁμαρτία is as such also as the doing of the ἀνομία." (Düsterdieck.) "*Quisquis committit peccatum, idem committit iniquitatem.*" (Erasmus.) Καὶ must neither be taken in a causal sense, nor changed into "yea" (Brückner); but we have to hold with Ebrard that the fuller idea, ποιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, in the beginning helps to qualify the other terms, ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν, and ἁμαρτάνειν, and that the antithesis ἁγνίζειν ἑαυτὸν is also coëfficient, and that the reference, so far from being to sins of haste or infirmity, is rather to sin, though only a single act, yet a *voluntary* act. Hence the following explanations cannot be received: that ἁμαρτία denotes *peccatum mortale* (Estius and the Roman Catholics), or "grave, unrepented sins" (Luther, al.), or that ποιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν is=*peccare contumaciter* (Aretius), *contra conscientiam et impœnitenter* (Rosenmüller), or *peccato operam dare* (Beza), *peccare scientem et volentem* (Spener), or the actual moral bias of life (Brückner). It is equally inadmissible to assume an intensification of the notion ἁμαρτία into ἀνομία (Baumgarten-Crusius, Bengel), or that ἀνομία includes crimes and vices proper, as if ἁμαρτία were the principle and source of the ἀνομία (de Wette). Paraphrases of ποιεῖν ἀνομίαν, such as *Deum offendere* (Grotius) and *religioni adversari* (Carpzov), do incorrectly weaken the idea. The two ideas, although distinguished from each other, are not convertible. We have here the general proposition: "whoever doeth sin, of whatever kind it be, doeth also lawlessness, violates the Divine rule and order," which is not directed against Antinomians, but against all those who are loose on the subject of sin; the idea of ἀνομία imparts a peculiar severity to that of sin.

And sin is lawlessness.—We must of course take ἁμαρτία here in the same sense, as in the clause immediately preceding, and in the same generality. Hence the first ἁμαρτία is not sinful doings, and the second an offence against God (Köstlin). The Article also forbids our taking ἁμαρτία as the predicate of the subject ἀνομία, as in Jno. i. 1. Ὁ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (Köstlin). 'Ανομία also is as general here as in the preceding clause. Νόμος denotes not only the Mosaic law of the O. T. but also the law of the N. T. in Christ, and by Him explained in the word and exhibited in the life (ii. 16; ii. 7; iv. 21; v. 3. cf Matth. v. 17-19), as the law written in man's heart for his special direction; it embraces the whole complex of the divine ἐντολαί. Hence this proposition contains not so much a definition (Sander), as the nature of sin viewed from that side on which its absolute opposition to every Divine fellowship shows itself in the most decided form (Brückner): "the Apostle could not have more sharply drawn the contrast of the nature of a believer who *is* a τέκνον θεοῦ and *will be* ὅμοιος θεῷ than by declaring ἁμαρτία to be ἀνομία." (Huther); or he that leads an ungodly life, abrogates the Divine rule of life to which he is subject as a Christian (Hofmann). Hence Hilgenfeld's exposition disfigures the thought: "not every one who deviates from the *ceremonial laws,* but the sinner only falls under the category of ἀνομία." Calvin also goes far beyond the contents of the verse in affirming the sum and substance of the thought to be that the life of those who yield themselves to sin is *hateful and unendurable to God.*—The Apostle annexes the sentence with καὶ and not with ὅτι, because he thereby gives the thought a more independent form. We cannot agree with Bengel in explaining καὶ by *imo,* as if before there had been only *conjuncta notio peccati et iniquitatis,* but now *eadem;* the identity is already expressed in the first sentence.—[The following definitions will shed additional light on this passage. Ambrose: "*Quid est peccatum nisi prævaricatio legis*

divinæ, et cœlestium inobedientia præceptorum."—Augustine: "*Peccatum est factum vel dictum vel concupitum aliquid contra æternem legem.*"—"*Quid verum est, nisi et Dominum dare præcepta, et animas liberæ esse voluntatis, et malum naturam non esse, sed esse aversionem a Dei præceptis?*"—"*Neque negandum est hoc Deum jubere, ita nos in facienda justitia esse debere perfectos, ut nullum habeamus omnino peccatum; nam neque peccatum erit, si quid erit, si non divinitus jubeatur, ut non sit.*"—M.]

Aid against sin. vv. 5. 6.

VER. 5. **And ye know that He was manifested in order that He might take away our sin.**—Appealing to their own consciousness, as at ch. ii. 12-14, 20, 27, the Apostle now refers to the Lord and affirms of Him two things: *First:* the purpose of His manifestation is the redemption from sin. Ἐκεῖνος denotes Christ, as in v. 8. It is wholly untenable to understand here the Gospel (Socinus, Episcopius, Grotius), concerning which it surely cannot be said that it τὰς ἁμαρτίας αἴρει, or that this is its end and aim.—Ἐφανερώθη the context requires us to apply to Christ's manifestation in the flesh. Cf. 1, 2. It points to Christ's previously hidden existence in heaven (Huther). The purpose of this manifestation is, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ. The reading ἡμῶν is well authenticated and intensifies the appeal to personal experience, without restricting the forgiveness of sins to those only who "suffer the beneficial purpose of the incarnation of the Son of God to be carried out on them in faith" (Düsterdieck), and to set back the universality of the Divine purpose of salvation (ch. ii. 2.); we would rather say that paracletic element, which after all is the main point here (v. 8), comes out more strongly; the οἴδατε, at least, does not contain sufficient ground for finding here a specific indication of the doctrinal. Nor is there any necessity for extending ἡμῶν to all men (Spener). "The Plural, τὰς ἁμαρτίας, affords a far more lucid and forcible view than if we had here, as in v. 4, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν; John does not take sin in its general character, but he adverts to all the forms of it." (Düsterdieck). It is wrong to explain it by *peccati reatum, dominium, pœnam* (J. Lange and others); but it signifies: the sins themselves. The αἴρειν connected here as at Jno. i. 29, with ἁμαρτία signifies in John's writings (Jno. xi. 48; xv. 2; xvii. 15; xix. 31, 38) *auferre*, to carry away, to take away. The ἀμνός, Jno. i. 29, the idea of the sacrificial lamb, implies what is expressed at 1 Pet. ii. 24, with reference to Is. liii. 4 sqq., by the verb ἀναφέρειν: to take upon oneself by way of atonement, substitution, death and reconciliation, while αἴρειν indicated a taking away by sanctification; Jno. i. 29 we have a blending of both meanings, while Peter adverts to one, the first, and John to the other, the second work of Christ, the former to His atonement, the latter to His work of redemption. John, who discusses the former at ch. ii. 2, dwells here upon the latter, and hence denies neither; nor does he separate the one from the other, as if the first were without this consequence, and the latter without that cause (ch. i. 7; iv. 9, 11; v. 6). But the context with its ethical import, that sin must be avoided and shunned, suggests the reference to the fact that Christ came for the purpose of removing sin, of taking it away from us; what Christian would then oppose or frustrate the design of Christ! Hence Oecumenius correctly observes that Christ came ἐπ' ἀναιρέσει τῆς ἁμαρτίας (so also Luther, Calvin, Neander, Ebrard, Düsterdieck, Huther, and al.)—Bede's remark, "*Tollit peccata et dimittendo, quæ facta sunt, et adjuvando, ne fiant, et perducendo ad vitam, ubi fieri omnino non possunt*," is perfectly true, but considerably transcends the measure of what is contained in this passage. The same applies to those who combine here said two references, e. g. Spener, Bengel (explains indeed "*tolleret*," but refers to his exposition of Jno. i. 29: "*primum a mundo in se recepit, deinde a se ipso devolvit peccati sarcinam*"), Lücke (in his 1st ed.), Sander, Besser.—Lücke (in the later edition), de Wette and others take αἴρειν=carry; false!

Secondly: He is sinless.

And sin is not in Him.—Καὶ coördinates this clause with the former. Oecumenius errs in his καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ διότι as well as in the paraphrase: καθ' ὅτι ἀμέτοχος ἦν ἁμαρτίας. So also Augustine: "*In quo non est peccatum, ipse venit auferre peccatum; nam si esset et in illo peccatum, auferendum esset illi, non ipse auferret,*" and a Lapide: "*Ideo Christus potens fuit tollere peccatum, quia carebat omni peccato, imo potestate peccandi.*" So also Sander, Neander and al. Ἔστι also must be retained and is not to be taken in the sense of ἦν Oecumenius, Grotius: "*peccatum in eo non* erat, *nempe, cum vitam mortalem* ageret," and al.); the reference here, as in v. 8, is "to the nature of Christ in its eternal consistence" [Huther]. Hence we may not say with Winer (p. 283) that "the sinlessness of Christ is considered as still present *in faith.*" Ἐν αὐτῷ, the reference of which has always to be determined by the context, denotes Christ understood in ἐκεῖνος, it denotes Christ Himself as to His Person and not (as Calov supposes) *totum corpus*, the Church, or as if we ought to explain ἐν αὐτῷ by ἐν κοινωνίᾳ μετ' αὐτοῦ. Thus the clause "and sin is not in Him" coördinated with that preceding it, is the foundation of the sequel, since the Sinless, Pure and Righteous One is held up not as an example or pattern, but as the vital power and element of life in which the Christian must *be* and *abide*.

The immediate consequence.

VER. 6. **Every one that abideth in Him sinneth not.**—By all means retain the full force of μένειν ἐν αὐτῷ to be and abide in Him, to derive nourishment from Him and His life (ch. i. 3. 6; ii. 5. 6; 23 sq.; 27 sq.), and do not exchange it for *credere in Christum*, or weaken it into *Christi discipulum esse* (Semler and al.); nor is ἁμαρτάνειν to be taken as = *persistere in peccato* (Luther), *sinere regnare peccatum* (Hunnius), *sceleratum esse* (Capellus), *peccata mortalia committere* (Roman Catholics), and to be thus enforced. The Apostle sets forth "abiding in Christ and sinning as irreconcilable opposites; but he does not mean to say that believing Christians entirely cease to sin or that those, who are yet sinning, are not yet in Christ (ch. i. 8-10; ii. 1, 2; iii. 3)" (Huther). "John is here dealing with realities and about to give us the signs whereby we may know whether we love the Lord or not, whether we are the children of God or of the wicked

one" (Sander). Hence it is rather hazardous to refer here with de Wette and Düsterdieck to the Apostle's *ideal* mode of representation, and a misapprehension of the fact that the Christian, though he sins, is yet free from sin, has actually parted company with it, and it is his properly Christian and inmost being in decided opposition to it, so that not sin, but his opposition to it (as something alien to his being), determines the conduct of his life, exactly as St. Paul puts it (Rom. vii. 17): "νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ, ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία." Augustine: "*Etsi infirmitate labitur, peccato tamen non consentit, quia potius gemendo luctatur.*"—"*In quantum in ipso manet, in tantum non peccat.*" Besser excellently says: "A Christian *does* not sin, but *suffers* it."

Every one that sinneth hath not seen Him, neither known Him.—As usual John turns the thought and develops it by an antithesis. The verb ἁμαρτάνειν has the same sense as in the preceding clause; actual sinning in word, or work or in the thought of the heart. Of such an one he says quite generally οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν. First of all we have to take οὐδὲ *disjunctively* (Winer, p. 509 sqq.); and although this does not decide the question which of the two verbs ὁρᾶν and γινώσκειν is the stronger and more important, yet it does indicate that they are different from each other. The pronoun αὐτὸν requires us to think in both verbs of the Person of Christ. Hence the sentence: ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν is not the object of ὁρᾶν, nor is the sentence: ἐφανερώθη ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ the object of γινώσκειν, in order to indicate the purpose of the whole redemptive work of Christ (Rickli, Neander). 'Ορᾶν, to *see*, physically (ch. i. 1, 3; iv. 20; Jno. i. 18; vi. 36, 46; viii. 57; ix. 37; xv. 24), spiritually (3 Jno. 11; Jno. iii. 11, 32; vi. 46; viii. 38; xiv. 7, 9), and that directly and immediately if used of Christ in heaven, or indirectly and mediately if applied to believers in consequence of their illumination,—denotes consequently in this passage "seeing Christ," "when we become absolutely conscious of the glory of Christ so that our spiritual eye beholds Him as He is in the totality of His Essence" (Huther); γινώσκειν means to know as the result of searching contemplation of His word, His life, the history of His kingdom, or of one's own experience in the life around us, or within ourselves, and indicates here "the right understanding of Him," brought about by said instrumentality, "so that we have become fully conscious both of His Nature and of His relation to us" (Huther). This intimates already that in the case of the former, viz. spiritual intuition and contemplation, the efficient agency belongs more to the object which represents itself before the eye of the spirit, and that in the case of the latter, viz. knowledge acquired by reflection in the way of reasoning and inquiry, the efficient agency belongs more to the subject, which makes it the object of contemplation (Sander, Huther). Hence it follows that ἑώρακεν is not something less, and οὐδὲ="much less" (Sander, Lücke 1st ed. al.), nor something more than ἔγνωκεν and οὐδὲ="and not even" (Socinus, Neander and al.); there is no reference whatever to a difference in degree. Although despite all their difference the two have something in common, we cannot, because of this latter circumstance, overlook or underrate the former [the difference] and say with Düsterdieck that the two notions are essentially equal and that ἔγνωκεν is simply added in order to indicate the spiritual import of ἑώρακεν. Of course it is impossible to interpret (with Lücke) ὁρᾶν of outward knowledge in spite of which one may sin, and γινώσκειν of real, spiritual knowledge. This connection is analogous to that of πιστεύειν and γινώσκειν (ch. iv. 16; Jno. vi. 69), so that ὁρᾶν and πιστεύειν might be combined yet so as to keep up the difference of πιστεύειν=ὁρᾶν from γινώσκειν. The force of these notions is very shallow in the explanation of Grotius: "*Neque de Christo sic cogitat, ut oportet, neque facto ostendit, se scire, quanti sit habenda Christi voluntas.*"—The Perfects, ἑώρακεν, ἔγνωκεν are to be preserved; they point to the past when the beginning of seeing and knowing took place, yet so that that which had its beginning in the past still acts and continues in the present, which is especially noticed by Erasmus (*cognitum habet*), Lücke, Brückner, Düsterdieck and Huther. It is wholly unwarranted to take the Perfect in the sense of the Present (Didymus: "*non videt eum*;" Augustine: "*non credit*;" Bede, Grotius, Estius, who construes the Perfect as a Hebraism for the Present). John's idea therefore is this: Every one that sinneth, and that while he is sinning, is one in whom seeing and knowing Christ is a fact of the past, but without continuing to act and to last to the present. Hence Bengel says not amiss: "*In ipso peccati momento talis fit, ac si eum nullo viderit modo.*"—Instructive is the reference to ch. ii. 19 (J. Lange, Sander) and the comparison with Matth. vii. 23: οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς (i. e. as mine). The reference is, as the ancients rightly observe, to an *efficax scientia* (Dydimus), an *affectiva et dilectiva* (Estius), although Lyra goes as much beyond the mark with his *fides formata caritate*, as Ebrard with his *loving* knowledge, or S. G. Lange with his γινώσκειν=*amare*. [Ignatius, the disciple of John, says: "No one who professeth *faith*, *sinneth*; and no one who hath *love*, *hateth*. They, who profess themselves *Christians*, will be manifested by what they *do*." (Ignatius, *ad Eph.*; also Jerome *in Jovin.* ii. 1, and *contra Pelagianos* I. 3).—M.]

The issue. vv. 7, 8, 9.

VER. 7. **Little children, let no one seduce you.**—This impressive address, (unchanged whether we read παιδία or τεκνία) introduces an admonition in respect of the clearly-perceived and ruin-fraught danger, unless they avail themselves of the aid provided in their glorious Lord and Saviour. The Apostle speaks of ἑαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν, ch. i. 8. Here, however, he adverts not to self-deception, but refers "in matters affecting the energizing and outwardly operative exhibition of the Divine life" (Düsterdieck), to deception and seductions coming from without, not springing from relations and events, but from men (μηδείς), who are more dangerous by far than relations or events. But there is no reason why we should think here of distinct forms of error, say e. g. those of the antinomian Gnostics (Düsterdieck, Huther). [On the other hand Ebrard and Wordsworth see here an unmistakable reference to the Gnostics. The latter ob-

serves: "that these verses cannot be understood without reference to their tenets and practices," and then mentions the followers of Simon Magus, who said that they could please God without righteousness, and that whatever might be the case with others, who had not their spiritual *gnôsis*, they themselves had *no need to work righteousness*, but that they would be saved by *grace*, whatever their works might be. "Liberos agere quæ velint; secundum enim ipsius (Simonis) *gratiam* salvari homines, sed non secundum *operas justas*." Irenæus I. 20 *ed. Grabe*. Hippolytus, *Philosoph.* p. 175; Theodoret, *Haer fab.* i. 1, who testifies that on the presumption of the indefectibility of special grace within themselves, they fell into all kinds of lasciviousness."—M.].—This admonition is in point of form like 1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 15, in point of sense like μὴ πλανᾶσθε, 1 Cor. vi. 9; 15–33; Luke xxi. 8. But that form at the same time exhibits a more lively sense of danger.

He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous.—On δικαιοσύνην ποιεῖν and δίκαιος, see notes on ch. ii. 29. The Apostle does not say here πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν, but only ὁ ποιῶν; the idea of unexceptional universality makes room for the importance of the fact. Instead of the predicate ἑώρακε αὐτὸν καὶ ἔγνωκεν αὐτὸν (v. 6), or μένει ἐν αὐτῷ (v. 6), or ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται (ch. ii. 29), there follows, as usual with the addition of a new particular, the consequence thereof, viz.: δίκαιός ἐστιν, either with reference to ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα (v. 2) or in order to denote the corresponding attitude towards the law. It is evident that the predicate is not acquired after that which is affirmed in the subject-sentence has taken place; the predicate is immanent in the subject, the nature of the righteous appears from his *doing* righteousness, it *is already in its existence* and does not only *become so*, as held by the Roman Catholics (Lyra, Emser, Estius, al.), and the Socinians, Arminians and Rationalists (Socinus, Grotius, al.) against the Protestants (Luther, Calvin). "He that *doeth* not righteousness, proves thereby that he *is* not righteous" (Huther). [Compare the words of Ignatius in the last note on v. 6. M.] The additional clause refers to the righteousness of Christ, as manifesting the righteousness of God and standing out as a bright pattern. The Apostle once more uses ἐκεῖνος, although the previous αὐτὸς designated Christ, so that he might have put αὐτὸς without giving rise to misunderstanding, and thus have absolutely removed any and every want of clearness, that αὐτὸς in ch. ii. 29 had reference to Christ. By Him the Christian should ever measure and adjust himself. Baumgarten-Crusius's explanation is altogether irrelevant; viz.: "he that is good, follows the example of Christ," or "he only that hath been righteous through Christ, doeth righteousness." [Huther justly observes, that as there is no reference whatever to justification in this passage, a Lapide's assertion, that the thought of this verse contradicts the Protestant Dogma of justification by faith, is altogether futile. The explanation of Lorinus also, that "ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην is =*qui habet in se justitiam, i. e. opus gratiæ, videlicet virtutem infusam*," is manifestly false.—M.].

VER. 8. **He that committeth sin, is of the devil.**—This is the progressive antithesis. On ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν compare note on v. 4. It is "the more significant and precise" expression for ἁμαρτάνειν v. 6 (Düsterdieck). Of such an one John does not say: ἄδικός ἐστι but ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν and thus states the final cause of the thought. The phrase ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου εἶναι must be interpreted after the analogy of ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι (cf. on ch. ii. 16), and this is the more incumbent upon us because verse 10 specifies τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ and τά τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου, and the paternal name is actually given to Satan at Jno. viii. 44. Still there is wanting an analogy to γεγεννῆσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. on ch. ii. 29) both for the adherents of the devil and the κόσμος, although we have ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἶναι at ch. ii. 16 and οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου at Luke xvi. 8. Hence, although ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου εἶναι contains no reference to a regeneration from beneath,—as if the devil had created the sinner, into whom he has only infused evil (Russmeyer), so that the Apostle adverts simply to *corruptio* and not to *generatio* (Bengel), and that consequently the phrase must be construed ethically and not physically (so that we cannot say τέκνον τοῦ διαβόλου in the same sense and with the same right as we say τέκνον θέου, see note on v. 10*a*),—yet are we obliged to think of an origin from the devil and of a sameness in kind and an intimate union with the devil as well as of an inheritance of woe in hell to be meted out to the devil and his adherents, and to reject the volatilization of the idea by perversion into a mere belonging to (de Wette), following (Semler), resembling and spiritual affinity with the devil (Grotius, Socinus, al.). Nor does the analogy warrant the assertion that it is not at all necessary to assume John to believe the existence of the devil, that this is only a mode of representation current among heretical Jewish Christians (Semler), or a Jewish formula of teaching without all dogmatical importance, or used only for the purpose of intensifying the idea of sin as hostility to God (Baumgarten-Crusius). See no. 4 below in "*Doctrinal and Ethical.*"

Because the devil sinneth from the beginning.—The connection by ὅτι specifies the reason of the sentence, "He that doeth sin is of the devil;" hence the reference is to man's sinning and his relation to the devil. For this reason ἀπ' ἀρχῆς emphatically put first, is to be interpreted of the beginning of man's sinning, like Jno. viii. 44, and the Apostle declares that from that beginning the devil has been showing himself as the sinner [the sinning one], he is not only a sinner in himself, but he did also bring about the first sin of man as a seducer, and not the first sin only, but he does bring about every sin even until now (the Present ἁμαρτάνει); sinning is his work from the beginning. Bengel: "*Omnium peccatorum causa est; nunquam satiatur.*" Hence there is no reference here to the beginning of the devil's existence from the creation of the world (Bede; for that would contradict Jno. viii. 44, οὐκ ἕστηκεν), or to the beginning of the creation of the earth and the solar system (Estius), or to the beginning of the *res humanæ* (Semler), or to the beginning of the devil's fall (Calvin, Calov, Bengel: "*Ex quo diabolus est diabolus; minime diu tenuisse videtur statum primitivum,*" Neander,

Sander and others.). Nor may we interpret ἁμαρτάνει like Bengel: "*Peccat et ad peccandum inducit,*" but rather compare Rom. vii. 17. The *influxus, suggestio, inspiratio, directio, coöperatio* of the devil (Calov) lie not in the verb ἁμαρτάνει, but in the whole context: because the devil has sinned from the beginning and goes on sinning, every one that is sinning is of the devil; for the real connection of the person sinning with the devil or of the devil with the person sinning, is here evidently presumed, yet so that the first proposition describes the state of the sinner as essentially belonging to the sphere of the devil's life and kingdom, while the second proposition, connected with the former by ὅτι, marks the continuing activity of the devil, so that the latter is the cause of the former.

For this was the Son of God manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil.—Bengel: "*Diabolus peccandi finem non facit; peccatum solvere filii dei opus est.*" Without using a conjunction the Apostle rapidly and in terse language specifies with sharpness and distinctness of outline the antithesis: διάβολος—υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; ἐκεῖνος would have been too weak and inadequate here, and contrasts the hidden seduction of Satan with the manifestation (ἐφανερώθη) of the Son of God for the destruction of the works of the devil (Jno. xii. 31; xvi. 11; Matth. xii. 29; Luke x. 18). He is not only δίκαιος (v. 7) but He also destroys sins (λύσῃ). This is the end of His coming, as in v. 5: αἴρειν τὰς ἁμαρτίας is parallel to λύειν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου. The last expression consequently denotes sins and, with reference to διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει, as the works of the devil who committeth them. Hence the reference is here to the ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου, sins, not to the wages of sin—affliction, death, condemnation (Calov, Spener). For these are rather the works of God who is righteous and decrees the penalty, and only by way of consequence the object of the redemptive work of Christ, but not the object of λύειν. This verb signifies the destruction of a building (Jno. ii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 10–12), or of a ship (Acts xxvii. 41) and also the loosing of chains (Acts xxii. 30). Bengel: ("*Opera confortissima quæ solvere res digna erat filio Dei*"), Spener, Besser and others retain the sense of "*loosening, untying,*" as if sins were the cords or bands of Satan; but this is manifestly a departure from the plain sense of the words and although useful for practical purposes, a rather artificial interpretation. Since nothing is said here of the three offices of Christ concurring in this work, or how that concurrence is to take place, the text neither authorizes us to assume that the *officium sacerdotale* and the *officium regium* without the *officium propheticum* will be engaged in the destruction of the works of the devil and to think only of the passion of our Lord, nor to infer anything for or against that sentence from "*Etiamsi Adam non peccasset, Christus incarnatus esset.*" Besides, John adverts only, as he had written (ἐφανερώθη—λύσῃ.) "to what Christ did purpose and achieve by His manifestation in the flesh" (Düsterdieck), without intending to describe or even to deny the continuous victory of Christ; he refers to that ch. i. 7; ii. 1, 2, 13, 14; iv. 4, 14; v. 5, but not primarily here. [Ignatius, the disciple of John, uses λύειν in the sense of the text, viz., the destruction of evil, ad Eph. i. 3, 19, λύεται ὄλεθρος, ἐλύετο πᾶσα μάγεια.—M.].

VER. 9. **Every one that is born of God, doth not commit sin, because his seed abideth in him.**—This is the antithesis of v. 8*a*, and ὅτι here like there denotes the reason why; the structure of the sentences too is alike, with the sole difference that by the usual inversion the subjects and predicates have changed places. Ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ *opp.*: ἐκ διαβόλου ἐστιν,—ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ *opp.*: ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν,—ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει *opp.*: ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει. Thus John contrasts sinning in its extreme and inmost nature with the children of God in the possession of their highest and most glorious gift and an attitude conformable thereto. Πᾶς denotes the general character of the sense. We know from ch. ii. 29; iii. 6, that being born of God, doing righteousness or not sinning belong together and that the former is incompatible with the commission of sin. Cf. ch. i. 5. Hence ἁμαρτίαν stands emphatically in ante-position; the Apostle regards sin as devilish, and righteousness as divine; and hence righteousness and sin are as absolutely and diametrically opposed to each other as are God and the devil. The clause annexed by ὅτι specifies the reason why one born of God does not commit sin, and being parallel to the similar clause in v. 8, sheds a light on the latter in confirmation of the interpretation given here. The reference of σπέρμα αὐτοῦ to θεοῦ is obvious. The seed of God necessarily denotes something that proceeds from God, is instinct with vital power and full of life, develops itself, blossoms and bears fruit, and begets the Divine. We cannot see here a reference to the word of God (with Clement of Alex., Augustine, Bede, Luther, Calov, Spener, Bengel, Besser, Socinus, Grotius and others), notwithstanding Matth. xiii. 3 sqq.; Jas. i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 15; Gal. iv. 19, because that simile from the vegetable kingdom does not answer to the reference to begetting and birth, and because the Word of God or the Gospel in other passages is mentioned only as the instrument of begetting, as a carrier and conductor of the Divine σπέρμα, but not the σπέρμα itself. [Alford, who takes the view impugned here, says: "But whether we regard the generation of plants, or animal procreation, which latter is more in question here, what words can more accurately describe the office of the seed, than these? And what is the word of God but the continually abiding and working seed of the new life in the child of God? Nay, it seems to be that exactly of which we are in search: not the Holy Spirit, the personal agent; not the power of the new life, the thing begotten; but just that which intervenes between the two, the word, the utterance of God,—dropt into the soul of man, taking it up by Divine power into itself, and developing the new life continually. This is in the most precise and satisfactory sense the σπέρμα τοῦ θεοῦ; and in this all Scripture symbolism is agreed: cf. 1 Pet. i. 23; Jas. i. 18. In fact, the very passage which is the key to this, is Jno. v. 38, τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε μένοντα ἐν ὑμῖν. Nor should any exception have been taken by Huther and Düsterdieck to the comparison with the para-

ble of the sower ("*wie viele ältere Ausleger mit ungeschickter Vergleichung von Matth.* xiii. 8 sqq." Düsterdieck), for though the attendant circumstances of generation are different, the analogy is the same."—M.] It follows from this that the reference is to the *Spirit of God*, even the *Holy Spirit*, who communicates Himself in and of His own. Hence σπέρμα must not be applied to His whole Person but as the πνεῦμα radiating from Him which is at once He Himself and His gift, a gift from Him and of His Nature. This construction is rendered imperative by ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ in the final and substantiating clause of this verse which runs parallel to σπέρμα. Just as one who is born of God is not on that account God and has not like Christ the fulness of God bodily indwelling, so σπέρμα is not the full Person of the Spirit of God, of the Holy Spirit, but something that comes forth from His Being, which, while it cannot be separated from Him, must be distinguished from Him. Therefore we have to say with the Greek expositors that σπέρμα is πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας, τὸ πνευματικὸν χάρισμα, the *Spiritus Sanctus et ejus virtus* (Calvin, Beza, Düsterdieck), *nativitas spiritualis* (Estius), *vires regenerationis* (S. Schmidt), *Divine life-powers* (de Wette, Neander), *the* πνεῦμα *begotten of the Holy Spirit* (Sander), *the germ of the new life, of the new man, Christ implanted in us* (Ebrard, Lücke, Huther). But it is not σπέρμα as analogous to זֶרַע=τέκνον (Bengel: "*semen dei i. e. qui natus est ex deo*"), or "*semen quasi divinum*" (Semler), *the formative principle of the good* (Paulus), or *religion* (Fritzsche).—It is important to recollect that while μένει is used of σπέρμα, μένει is also said of the believer (v. 6), and that he is bidden notwithstanding: μένετε= (ch. ii. 28). On this account, and because the reference is not to a full ear of grain gathered in the barn, but to σπέρμα cast into the earth destined to grow under the influence of all kinds of weather, we need not suppose, that therefore it *must abide* and could neither be lost again nor perish. Nothing is said on this point, it is neither affirmed nor denied, and therefore we are not warranted to introduce or assume it here: the subject in question is simply and solely that in the σπέρμα and its abiding in conformity with its nature, the child of God receives the power of not committing sin. Although we cannot explain ὅτι by ἐφ' ὅσον as if it were=*quantum, quamdiu, quatenus*, it is involved in the thought (The Greek, R. Catholic and Evangelical commentators).

And he cannot sin, because he is born of God.—Now the Apostle adds the most important particular, viz., his inability of sinning on the ground of his having been born of God, with which St. John began, as he now concludes this section. With reference to the seed of God abiding in the child of God, he now asserts the absolute contrariety of a child of God and sinning in the words: οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν. *Non potest peccare* is at all events much stronger and more than *potest non peccare;* it declares not the possibility of not sinning, but the impossibility of sinning. A servant of sin has become a servant of righteousness (Rom. vi. 16–23); in virtue of the seed of God abiding in him he only wills and only can do the Divine, righteousness (Düsterdieck and most expositors); hence ἁμαρτάνειν must neither be intensified into "*committing mortal sins*" (the Romanists), *to sin diabolically* (Besser), *to sin deliberately and intentionally* (Ebrard), nor be limited to *hating the brethren* (Augustine, Bede), nor must οὐ δύναται be weakened into *ægre, difficulter est* (Grotius, "*res aliena est ab ejus ingenio;*" Paulus, "*his whole spiritual nature and* HABIT *resist it*"). Nor must it be changed into οὐ βούλεται (the Greek commentators) or *non debet.* Nor is this declaration of the Apostle only a goal and standard far above the reality of the Christian life on earth, only of relative importance and without reality. Bengel: "*Res se habet, ut in abstemio, qui non potest vinum bibere, et in variis antipathiæ generibus.*" On the substantiating clause Bengel strikingly observes: "*priora verba ex deo majorem habent in pronunciando accentum; quod ubi observatur, patet, non idem per idem probari, collato initio versus.*" Because he is born *of God*, he that is *born* of God cannot sin; the *child* of God cannot sin, because it is the child of God. Very pertinent also is the note of Luther: "*In summa nos Christiani nascimur, nec fuco quodam aut specie, sed ipsa natura sumus Christiani, quare non est possibile ut peccemus.*" [Wordsworth: "He that hath been born of God, and liveth as a son of God *cannot be a sinner.* It is inconsistent with the essential condition of his *spiritual birth*, by which he is *dead* to sin. It is contrary to the nature which he has as a *child of God.* This is well expressed by Didymus here, who says, "St. John does not assert that the man who has been born of God *will never* commit sin; but he asserts that he does not *work sin.*—*Non scriptum est non peccabit, sed non peccatum facit, non idem est peccare et peccatum facere;* a child of two days old, by reason of his *natural* childhood, cannot sin, but a child of *God* cannot be a *sinner.*" This distinction he draws from the difference between the Present Infinite and the Aorist Infinitive; see Winer § 44, p. 346, 348, 349, who quotes from Stallbaum, *Plat. Euthyd.*, p. 140: "*Aoristus* (*Infin.*) *quia nullam facit significationem perpetuitatis et continuationis, prouti vel initium vel progressus vel finis actionis verbo expressæ spectatur, ita solet usurpari, ut dicatur vel de eo, quod statim et e vestigio fit ideoque etiam certo futurum est, vel de re semel tantum eveniente, quæ diurnitatis et perpetuitatis cogitationem aut non fert aut certe non requirit, vel denique de re brevi et uno veluti temporis ictu peracta.*" Thus e. g. πιστεῦσαι is to make a *profession* of faith, or *an act* of faith, at a particular time; but πιστεύειν is to *believe*, to be a *believer;* δουλεῦσαι is to do *an act of service*, δουλεύειν, *to be a slave;* οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν, no *servant* can be a *slave to two masters;* so ἁμαρτεῖν is to commit *a sin*, but ἁμαρτάνειν is much more than this, it is *to be a sinner.*"

Ignatius, *ad. Eph.* 8 says: "Let no one *deceive* you. They who are carnal *cannot* do the things which are *spiritual;* nor can they who are *spiritual* do the things which are *carnal.* Faith *cannot* do the works of unbelief, nor can *unbelief* do the works of faith. The works which ye do in the flesh are spiritual, because ye work all your works in *Jesus Christ.*"—M.].

Conclusion. v. 10*a.*

VER. 10*a.* **In this are manifest the children of God and the children of the de-**

vii.—Ἐν τούτῳ refers back to the preceding. Cf. on ch. ii. 3. The point under notice is ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ and ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου εἶναι. This is apparent in the doing of righteousness or in the working of sin, the sinner entangling himself in sin, as a child of the devil, while the believer, as being born of God, resists it. *Being* a child of God or a child of the devil is hidden and manifest in *doing*. Hence this clause must not be referred to the sequel (Grotius, Spener, Ebrard and others) as there is not the least occasion for it; de Wette, Sander, and others leave this point undetermined. It is not said here to whom τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ and τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου φανερά ἐστιν, but v. 1 (κόσμος οὐ γινώσκει ἡμᾶς) renders it certain that it is not manifest to the world but only to the Christian. That difference is only manifest in the light of the divine κρίσις, the uncritical world blends together and confounds good and evil, God and the devil (Lücke, Sander). "To the children of the devil their own moral nature remains a mystery until they accept the judgment of the Holy Spirit and through the divine seed are born of God and become the children of God." Cf. Matth. vii. 16–21; Luke vi. 43–46.—The phrase τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου occurs only here in the New Testament although we encounter the following variations: υἱὸς διαβόλου said of Elymas Bar-Jesus, Acts xiii. 10; ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας said of Judas, Jno. xvii. 12; and υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας and τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς, Eph. ii. 3, instead of which τέκνον τοῦ διαβόλου might have been used, if that expression had not been studiously avoided in order to prevent the misunderstanding that we might as well speak of a birth (out) of the devil as of a birth (out) of God (see notes on v. 8) and in order not to give nourishment to the dualistic notion that their conversion or regeneration is impossible, to intimate, on the contrary, that it is more probable to see a child of the devil become a child of God than a child of God become a child of the devil. But it cannot be inferred from these different expressions that the terms τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ and τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου denote the two extremes between which other men are found. This antithesis embraces rather the totality of mankind just as ἁμαρτάνειν and οὐχ ἁμαρτάνειν comprise the whole attitude of men. Socinus is surely right: "*Ex apostoli verbis satis aperte colligi potest, quod inter filios dei et filios diaboli nulli sint homines medii.*"

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The nature of sin.* The word ἁμαρτία while indicating aberration from the right way, the right goal, the straight direction and order does not tell us wherefrom said aberration takes place. On this account the word ἀνομία is added. It is evident that sin is in direct antagonism to the νόμος, the divine ordinance. Hofmann pertinently compares 2 Thes. ii. 7 (*Schriftbeweis* I., 487). The first thing is that sin contradicts the divine ordinance. The extent of ἀνομία is also that of ἁμαρτία; whatever does not accord with the divine ordinance of life, be it little or small or as it please, is ἁμαρτία, which is always to be regarded primarily as an injury done to God who has appointed the νόμος. Hence the notion of guilt adheres at all events to the notion of sin, although the sinner be not conscious of it at the time or soon after the act; the sense of guilt is sure to come sooner or later, but invariably with the knowledge of sin, even as David expresses it: "Against *thee only*, have I sinned" (Ps. li. 4) and St. Paul ὑπόδικος τῷ θεῷ (Rom. iii. 19). The injury done to one's own soul which lies at the bottom of ἁγνίζειν ἑαυτὸν, and is declared in τηρεῖ αὐτὸν as contrasted (ἀλλὰ) with ἁμαρτάνειν is likewise the reason why the sinner is outside of fellowship with Christ who is life, gives life and takes away sin.

[Pearson (p. 539) says: "The law of God is the rule of the actions of men, and any aberration from that rule is sin: the law of God is pure and whatsoever is contrary to the law is impure. Whatsoever therefore is done by man, or is in man, having any contrariety or opposition to the law of God, is sin. Every action, every word, every thought, against the law, is a sin of omission, as it is terminated to an object dissonant from, and contrary to, the prohibition of the law, as a negative precept. Every omission of a duty required of us is a sin, as being contrary to the commanding part of the law, or an affirmative precept. Every evil habit contracted in the soul of man by the actions committed against the law of God, is a sin constituting a man truly a sinner, even then, when he actually sinneth not. Any corruption and inclination in the soul, to do that which God forbiddeth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever such corruption and evil inclination came into the soul, whether by an act of his own will, or by the act of the will of another, is a sin, as being something dissonant from, and repugnant to the law of God. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the nature of sin."—M.]

2. *The nature of righteousness*, as the opposite of sin, is therefore a conduct consonant with the νόμος, a doing regulated by the divine ordinances of life, from the work of our hands to the act of thinking and the power of the will.

3. *The corruption* of sin is manifest in that it entangles men in a relation to Satan which at once defines his attitude and shows itself in it. It comes from Satan and is the act of Satan, so that living in sin and the working of sin are evidences of the sinner's dependence on the devil, his appurtenance and similarity of nature to the devil. Although man's sin is the sin of the seduced, in virtue of such seduction he is yet as much doomed to the power of the kingdom of the Evil One as he is guilty before God; and he that ought and might have become a child of God, has become a child of the devil. As surely as fellowship with God and righteousness are gained in Christ, so surely does sin evidence fellowship with the devil.

4. *Satan* is a person, opposed to God, the opposite of God and not only of Christ, who came to take away sin and to destroy the works of the devil. Strauss (*Dogmatik* II. 15) justly observes: "The whole idea of Messiah and His kingdom is as impossible without its counterpart of a kingdom of demons with a personal head, as the north pole of a magnet without the south pole. If Christ came to destroy the works of the devil, there was no necessity for His coming if there was no devil; if there is a devil, but only as the personification of the principle of evil—well, then we ought also to be satisfied with a

Christ as an impersonal idea." Besides to deny the existence and personality of the devil is to give up the personality of God Himself. God would be *the Absolute* and not the absolute Personality, if in this Johannean complex of ideas we are permitted to understand Satan to be only a principle, though it be the cosmical.—But there are here no data whatsoever for a dualistic conception. *Two* things are certain; *First:* the devil's opposition to God cannot be so construed as to give the devil the character of the contestant counter-god from all eternity and to divest him of the attributes of the creature; the text contains no warranty for either; the purpose of Christ's manifestation and the circumstance that this purpose must be supposed to be fully accomplished and accomplishing in all essential points, warrant us rather to conclude that said true assumptions, as a perfectly *dualistic* opposition of the devil and God, are incompatible with the fundamental views of the Apostle. *Secondly:* it cannot be inferred from this passage that men are naturally and essentially devilish. For John plainly declares that not the devil's *nature* (to which he does not make the faintest allusion), but the devil's work shows itself in the sins of men and that Christ came not to destroy the nature of the devil but to destroy the works of the devil. Nor must it be overlooked that, as contrasted with the terms *γεγεννημένος ἐν τοῦ θεοῦ, σπέρμα θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐκ θεοῦ εἶναι, ἐκ αὐτῷ μένων, τέκνον θεοῦ*, the Apostle is very sparing in his reference to the devil and does not go beyond saying *ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου εἶναι* and *τέκνον τοῦ διαβόλου*, opposing the latter term, as it were by constraint, to the phrase "child of God," so that *Augustine* justly refers to an *imitari diabolum*, observing: "*Omnes peccatores ex diabolo nati sunt, in quantum peccatores. Adam a deo factus est, sed quando consensit diabolo, ex diabolo natus est, et tales omnes genuit qualis erat.*" There is not the faintest intimation for the supposition that man does not sin of his own will, not *voluntaria* but *naturaliter*, and that the sin which he commits is not his fault, but solely the devil's fault; the contrary is evident from the exhortation in v. 7 and the paracletical tendency which lies at the bottom of the whole. Neither dualism nor determinism can be deduced from this passage. But concerning subjection and personal transactions reference is made to cosmical powers in God the Father with the Son and in the devil, as the ultimate and chief factors of all personal development.

5. The *work* of Satan is sin, and sin from the beginning, *i. e.* from the beginning of sin on the part of mankind, which is the only subject under notice here. Hence he is most truly *the* sinner, the original sinner. As he was actively engaged in the first sin, so he still is actively engaged in every sin. But beyond this fact nothing is said as to the nature of his activity, as to its concurrence with that of man which is not excluded, and as to the manner how sin comes to pass. But it is intimated that contrary to *Christ* who was *manifested* and did appear in order to destroy the works of the devil, the *devil* was not manifested but remained and continued to walk *in concealment*, and that the children of God and the children of the devil cannot be identified at once, even as the world (which knows neither God nor the children of God (v. 1), nor itself) does not discover the devil's work in its own sin; for the reference is to *πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας* (Eph. vi. 12). It is just the man, who, as St. James says (ch. i. 14 sq.), is incited and enticed by *his own lust* (*ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελκόμενος καὶ δελεαζόμενος*) and commits sin without an inward struggle, without offering any resistance, in a calm course of development (*ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*), has the devil as the father of sin and is himself a child of the devil. In sins it becomes manifest that the anti-divine on earth is intimately and vitally connected with the kingdom and influence of the devil and that ultimately the whole matter resolves itself into a world-combat between God and the devil, and a world-victory of God in Christ over the devil (compare Harless, *Ethics* § 28. ***: Nitzsch, *System.* p. 244. sqq.)

6. *Redemption from sin is the work of the Sinless One, the purpose of the manifestation* of the Sinless One, whose aim it is not to bring a *new* doctrine but to produce a new *life.* According to this the most important thing is, of course, not the *exposition* of the law marked by the utmost profoundness of apprehension and lucidity of statement, but the *exhibition* of the law to its full extent in a pure life, which not only evinces its strength in suffering and the assumption of human sin, but also satisfies and reconciles the Father, so that for the Son's sake He now once more turns to mankind as hallowed and mankind overcome and attracted by the Sinless One, parts company with sin and turns away from it. It is inconceivable to have known and understood the Sinless One and yet to continue in sin all the same; to abide in Christ and to abide in sin are incompatible opposites; the one excludes the other. John, to be sure, has respect only to the principle or the result, as the issue is a life that terminates not in a moment but has its historical course and internal development. This is predicated of the life in Christ (vv. 2, 3,) and by analogy we are constrained to assume it of the life in sin.

7. *Being* determines the *doing*, the doing does not determine the being, but we know the being from the doing. The being is the cause, the doing the effect. Hence he that does not commit sin but worketh righteousness (vv. 6, 7, 8, 9) must be born of God (ch. ii. 29; iii. 9, 10) and have seen and known Christ (ch. iii. 6), but he that is of the devil, commits sin and worketh no righteousness (v. 8). So Luther (*Erlangen ed.* 27, 191): "Good, pious works nevermore make a good, pious man, but a good pious man will do good, pious works. Evil works nevermore make an evil man, but an evil man will do evil works. Consequently the person must everyways be good and pious prior to all good works, and good works must follow and proceed from the good, pious person (Matth. vii. 18)." Hence a man must have become righteous by justification, before he can act righteously in sanctification. This is the truth and the right of the Lutheran and Reformed confessions in opposition to Rome; but on the subject of *becoming* righteous John confines himself to saying that it takes place (out) of God in Christ by regeneration and propitiation; hence it simply indicates the objective ground and not the subjective accomplishment. On this point no

other particulars can be inferred from our passage.

8. While the *not-sinning* and the *impossibility of sinning* on the part of a Christian born of God, must be held fast as a fact, we must be on our guard against hasty inferences therefrom, for which John gives us no warrant. In the first place this passage (v. 9) must be susceptible of a construction that does not contradict ch. i. 8 sqq., for John could not have made both statements, if they were incompatible with one another. Hence the Roman Catholics are as much in the wrong for holding, as de Lyra says, that it is the prerogative of the saints, *i. e.* only individuals in virtue of special grace in regeneration, not to sin and not being able to sin, as are the Lutherans for contending that *all* truly regenerated persons live without sin; for such an assertion is as arrogant as that contained in the sentence of Seneca, the Stoic (see Düsterdieck II. 148 from Wetstein): "*Vir bonus non potest non facere, quod facit; in omni actu par sibi, jam non consilio bonus, sed more eo perductus; ut non tantum recte facere possit, sed nisi recte facere non possit.*" 1 Jno. i. 8 sqq. forbids such a construction of ch. iii. 9. The Gichtelites, who in virtue of Matth. xxii, 30 used to call themselves the brethren of the angels and refusing to be considered a sect laid claim to being the invisible Church, and the Molinists who were Quietists, claimed with some Pietists such a state of perfection and being called Perfectists by their adversaries, called them in turn *Conatists;* the Methodists who maintain that they stand daily and hourly in need of the atoning merits of Christ do not belong to this category although they hold the sinless perfection of the regenerate; but this certainly exposes them like the Roman Catholics to the danger of regarding or treating concupiscence as a matter of indifference. The Synod of Dort, moreover, cannot on the strength of this passage reject the following proposition (see Niemeyer, p. 719 sub III): "*Vere credentes et regenitos non tantum posse a fide justificante, item gratia et salute totaliter et finaliter excidere, sed etiam reipsa non raro ex iis excidere atque in æternum perire,*" nor is *Calvin* warranted to say: "*Johannes non solum docet, quam efficaciter agat semel deus in homine, sed clare affirmat, spiritum suam gratiam in nobis* AD EXTREMUM USQUE PERSEQUI, UT AD VITÆ NOVITATEM INFLEXIBILIS PERSEVERANTIA ACCEDAT," because the Apostle teaches here not a word on that subject. He neither says ch. i. 8 sqq. that the regenerate in reality does not seldom fall from grace and perish eternally (!), but only, that his sinning notwithstanding, his sins would be forgiven him, nor here at ch. iii. 9, that the gift of sonship and regeneration can never be lost again or impaired, or that the σπέρμα is and must be brought to perfection in every child of God, or that the *donum perseverantiæ* is added by God to the gift of His grace. so that the two are intimately united and inseparable. A view hitting the truth may be found already in *Jovinian* (at the end of the fourth century) as stated in the controversial writing of his opponent (Hieronymus *adv. Jovinianum* libri II), if we remember that he said besides what here follows, viz: "*eos, qui plena fide in baptismate renati sunt, a diabolo non posse subverti,*" or "*a diabolo non posse tentari; quicunque autem tentati fuerint, ostendi eos aqua tantum et non spiritu baptizatos*"—that the Christian is not called upon to fight and to labour "*ut majora præmia accipiat*" but only "*ne perdat quod accepit,*" and that he did add "*qui suum baptisma servaverint.*" For John neither affirms nor excludes by an intimation that the work and act of God to man must be accepted and received by man, that man with the divinely-given strength must become self-acting so that he not only do not resist and thus not resisting, *obicem non ponens*, become sanctified after having been justified, but also that entering into the work and act of God he exercise himself by his own personal efforts and thus appropriate more and more and receive into his own nature that which is God's, by giving up and sacrificing his self without doing injury to his seity. All these things John does not touch upon because he is not concerned with subjective execution but solely with the objective ground and foundation. Hence he says: he that is born of God, as such (as God's child), without any reference to his former condition and its reaction, does not really sin in the literal acceptation of the term; sin may still take place in him, but *he* himself, as the child of God, in the power of regeneration, *does* not and *cannot* commit it (cf. Harless *Ethics* § 26. **).—Hence we cannot see at all why the regenerate, if he neglects, in conflicts and collisions which may arise, to be on his guard and to hold fast all that God has given to him, done for him and is offering to him, may not by degrees fall entirely from grace, and such an issue necessitates or justifies the assumption that God did not seriously intend, energetically will and efficiently accomplish his regeneration and that lastly the lapsed was right and God in the wrong, that it is God's fault that he, though already redeemed from the power of the devil, had again fallen a prey to the devil. Heb. vi. 4 sqq. which only declares that it is impossible to recover those who have fallen away from such true regeneration has no connection with this passage (in opposition to *Ebrard*), but we ought rather to take note of μένων in v. 6., which points to that unexpressed train of thought. Cf. Rom. vii. 15 sqq. where mention is made of the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος as the σπέρμα θεοῦ and the ἐγὼ of the regenerate warring against the old *ego*.—[Düsterdieck: "The difference between the older and more modern expositors[1] lies in this, that the former are more anxious to moderate the details of the Apostle's sentiment, and to tone down his assertion to the actual life of Christians, while the moderns recognize the full precision of the text as it stands, but then remind us that the ideal truth of the principle announced by St. John continually, so to speak, floats above the actual life of believers as their rule and aim, and that, in so far, the Apostle's saying finds in such actual life only a relative fulfilment. None however of all the expositors, who in any way has recognized the ideal character of St. John's view, has overlooked the fact, that even in the actual life of all that are born of God there is something which in full verity answers to the ideal words "they cannot sin." The children of God, in whom the Divine

1. Lücke, Rickli, de Wette and Neander.

seed of their eternal life abides, have, in reality, a holy privilege, as Steinhofer says,—they sin not and they cannot sin, just in proportion as the new Divine life, unconditionally opposed to all sin, and manifesting itself in godlike righteousness, is present and abides in them. Expositors of all these logical tendencies, in all times, *e. g.* Didymus, Oecum., Estius, Schlichting, Luther, Hunnius, Seb. Schmidt, Calov, Bengel, Joachim Lange, Rosenmüller, Lücke, Neander, etc. point to this, that the new life of believers, veritably begotten by regeneration from God, is simply incompatible with sin[1]; the life which essentially alienates the spirit from all sin,[2] fills it with an irreconcilable hate against every sin, and urges it to an increasing conflict against all unrighteousness. Luther excellently says, that a child of God in this conflict receives indeed wounds daily, but never throws away his arms or makes peace with his deadly foe. Sin is ever active, but no longer dominant; the normal direction of life's energies in the believer is against sin, is an absence of sin, a no-will-to-sin and a no-power-to-sin. He that is born of God has become, from being a servant of sin, a servant of righteousness; according to the Divine seed remaining in him, or, as St. Paul says, according to the inner man[3], he will and he can work only that which is like God,—righteousness, though the flesh not yet fully mortified, rebels and sins: so that even in and by the power of the new life sin must be ever confessed, forgiveness received[4], the temptation of the evil one avoided and overcome[5], and self-purification and sanctification carried on."—M.].

9. *John* speaks of being born in order to live, *Paul* of dying in order to live.

[Ezek. Hopkins: This place may, perhaps, be among the number of those, that had been more clear, if they had been less expounded. I shall only give you the genuine native sense of the words and then proceed to manage them to my present purpose. *Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin.* Some from hence have concluded a possibility, at least, of a sinless state in this life: others, the infallible certainty of it; not only that a child of God might attain to such a perfection as is exclusive of all sin, but that whoever is a child of God cannot upon that very account be guilty of any sin: so like are errors to precipices, that, if a man lose his firm footing, usually he falls headlong; nor does he stop, till he dash himself against the bottom and foundation of all religion and piety: had these men but seriously pondered what the same Apostle saith in his first chapter, vv. 8, 10: "*If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us;*" and "*If we say that we have not sinned, we make* God *a liar,*" they would not have entertained such an over-weening conceit of a spotless perfection of life here; whereof the greatest part is no better than sin and the best of it, but too, too much defiled with it. Others interpret thus: So long as we are the children of God, we cannot sin; and so the Papists go; but these go upon an erroneous supposition, that every mortal sin, as they call them, makes an intercision of justifying grace; and doth, as it were, annihilate the new creature. Others interpret it thus: *in quantum sumus filii Dei:* we cannot sin under that respect and notion, as we are the children of God; but even so far as we are, the best of us in the most part, unrenewed; though this is a certain truth, yet it is but a dilute and waterish exposition of this place; and it amounts to no more than this, that a regenerate man sins not as he is regenerate, that the principle of grace in him is not that principle from whence sinful actions proceed; and certainly, no man, that considers the weight of this Scripture expression, will think that the Apostle, by such an instance and ingemination, would press so thin a meaning as this is. The interpretation, therefore, that I judge to be the most natural and unforced is this: He, that *is born of God, doth not commit sin;* that is, he doth not sin in that malignant manner, in which the children of the devil do: he doth not make a trade of sin, nor live in the constant and allowed practice of it. Neither can he thus sin, because *his seed remaineth in him;* that is either the energy of the word of God whereby he is begotten again to a spiritual life, or the complexion of the graces of the spirit that are as it were the seminary and the seed-plot of glory. Nor he cannot sin, *because his seed remaineth in him:* this seed remains, and keeps him, that he cannot sin; either as apostates do who totally forsake the ways of God, or as profane persons do, who never embraced them. There is a great difference betwixt regenerate and unregenerate persons, in the very sins that they commit: all, indeed, sin; but a child of God cannot sin; that is, though he doth sin, yet he cannot sin after such a manner as wicked and unregenerate men do: there is a vast difference betwixt them, even in that wherein they do most of all agree: see that place in Deut. xxxii. 5. *Their spot is not the spot of his children:* even deformities themselves are characteristic: and a true Christian may come to know by his sins, that he is not a sinner. And, as they differ in the committing of sin, so much more in the opposing of it."—M.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Thou art wont in other respects to attach importance to the right name and the right word. Well, sin is immorality; what thou callest a slip, an error, an infirmity or a foible, is essentially—immorality.—Be not concerned as much about earthly losses or disgrace before men as about outraging the Divine majesty, which marks the nature of sin even more graphically than the outrage done to thy own soul.—What does it avail thee to be praised of men, even in newspapers, if God regards thee as a transgressor? Remember the case of Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, who was hateful to the Emperor; the courtiers said: "Burn him, confiscate his property, put him in irons, and have him killed." But others replied, saying: "You will not gain anything by all this; for in exile he would find a home with his God; you deprive the poor, not him, of property; he kisses his chains; death

1. Didymus: ἀκόλουθον καὶ ἀνάρμοστον.
2. Oecumenius: ἀνεπίδεκτον ἁμαρτίας τὸν νοῦν ἡμῶν ποιεῖ.
3. Rom. viii. 15.
4. Ch. i. 8 sqq.
5. V. 18.

opens heaven to him. There is only one way to render him unhappy; force him to sin; *he fears nothing in the world but sin.*"—Dost thou honestly abide the law of the land, especially the fundamental law—then maintain also the law of God's kingdom, His fundamental law.—The sinner does the very thing which Christ desires to remove: he twines for Him a crown of thorns and crucifies Him anew.—Hold fast the sinlessness and death of Christ. Why was it necessary for the Sinless One to die if not for the sin of men? What is he that does not like the Sinless One and does every thing in his power to put Him out of the way? What is the public opinion which crowned that attempt with success? Of what consequence must sin be, if He had to die by and for it?—He did not come for the sake of the doctrine, which did not take away sin, that the prophet might be praised, but He came for the sake of sin, that the Lamb of God and the High priest might be praised together.—He came to acquire for Himself a people that it might live of and by Him; He came not to receive from it what were its possessions, but to take away from it, what is its grievance and to grant to it His glory.—A Christian, as a Christian, never *does* sin, he only *suffers* it.—In and with Christ we lose all pleasure in sin and loathe its service.—Sin dazzles men and prevents their seeing and knowing the glory of Christ.—To overlook the glory of Christ denotes not a low degree of immorality.—The illumination of our spirit is not without the purification of our heart, without the deliverance of our will from the chains of sin.—As sin is ever growing so that thin threads of lust become cords of vanity and cart-ropes of unrighteousness (Is. v. 18), the small rent of doubt grows into a shipwreck concerning faith (1 Tim. i. 19) and a little spark causes a great fire (Jas. iii. 5), so in like manner the forgiveness of sins in justification grows to the annihilation of sin in sanctification, and the regenerate grows into manhood, so that while Ahab, though wholly mail-clad, was mortally wounded in one place, Paul though bitten by a venomous viper, shook off the beast into the fire and remained unhurt.—Christ is the point where men must choose the way that leadeth to the kingdom of darkness, or that which conducts to the kingdom of light.—Man's way ends in the former kingdom with his belonging to Satan, but it *begins* in the latter with his regeneration.—Just those who are the devil's know least of him, deny his existence and personality; those who with God resist him, know his nature and power much better than his servants.—Be not deceived, 1. Concerning the nature of sin; 2. Concerning the glory of Christ; 3. Concerning the activity of Satan; 4. Concerning the power of regeneration.—Fear sin! 1. It breaks the ordinance of God; 2. It is the cause of Christ's sufferings; 3. It leads to the slavery of Satan; 4. It destroys thy adoption of God.—Child of God, rejoice! 1. God's law is a sure and straight path; 2. The merit of Christ affords thee a mighty help; 3. The gift of the Spirit will yield thee precious fruit.

AUGUSTINE:—The doing of righteousness does not precede but succeed justification.

STARKE:—Whatever is contrary to the law of God, whether done inwardly or outwardly, in thought, manner, words or works—is sin.—Let every one diligently study the law of God so that he may learn what is right and wrong and not do ignorantly what might have been avoided.—Sin must be a terrible and horrible thing, becaus for its sake Christ had to come, to suffer and to die. Every thing is in harmony: begone, sin! there is no room for thee with the redeemed! It is apostasy from the law, the opposite of the Image of Christ, the progeny of Satan, a mark of his slaves.—Thou sayest: I am a sinful man and not a sinful angel! True; but if thou art truly a believing Christian, sin must not reign in thee but thou must reign over sin and not serve sin in any particular.—Not certain, believers are exposed to the danger of being seduced.—Appearance, propriety of conduct, and observance of the externals of worship are not paramount in Christianity, but the heart must be changed and that takes place in regeneration.—It is ill-befitting a Christian to appeal to and boast of his illustrious descent, the distinction of his family and connections; the grace of regeneration, which invests him with the prerogatives of the adoption, truly ennobles him before God and men.—The children of Satan are often unknown, but more to themselves and those like them than to the godly.—The godly also are often hidden, but more from the ungodly than from themselves, for they know very well in virtue of the spirit of adoption both what they have received and what is promised to them.—There is a difference between the children of God and the children of the devil; they may and ought to be identified, but the identification requires a spiritual discernment, otherwise it cannot take place.—Honest preachers must not give evangelical consolation to those who are openly ungodly, though they say that preachers cannot condemn. True; they cannot condemn but they can denounce the damnable condition.

BENGEL:—"*Iniquitas horribilius quiddam, apud eos præsertim, qui legem et dei voluntatem magni faciunt, sonat, quam peccatum. Ex lege agnitio peccati. Linea curva cernitur per se; sed magis, ad regulam collata.*"

STEINHOFER:—The children of God in whom the divine seed of their eternal life is truly abiding, have really the holy privilege of not being able to sin.

HEUBNER:—Not the hurtfulness of sin is its nature, for that is accidental, but its opposition to God.—The chief purpose of the manifestation of Christ was the cancelling of sin, the atonement for our sin, and sanctification by means of reconciliation. Hence continuing in sin frustrates the purpose of Christ and contradicts His holiness.—Christianity is not *gnosis*, but an honest mind and conversation.—Recollect that as long as sinning is thy element, thou art in the devil's sphere and exposed to his influence.—Take note: 1. That the destruction of the works of the devil is not something that has been done, finished and perfected once for all but is progressive in its nature, advancing to perfection to the end of time. 2. That Christ has laid the foundation by His suffering and death as well as by the establishment of His Church, that incessant warfare may be waged against the kingdom of the devil and that at the last it shall be entirely destroyed. 3. That Christ has enabled all who believe in Him

and receive His power to overcome Satan. The power of Satan is broken in believers. The works of the devil are being destroyed in proportion as the Gospel spreads intensively and extensively. 4. That the absolute and total destruction of the kingdom of the devil will take place at the second coming of Christ. Then it will be fully consummated. At present believers are only called upon to make war against Satan.—As the seed does only push forth the fruit it contains, and cannot produce a fruit different in kind, and as it is peculiar to the nature, even to the germinating principle in the seed to produce the right fruit, so it is also with those in whom is laid the seed of God, the Spirit of God; its germinating principle prompts godliness of living. But this does not warrant the assertion of absolute sinlessness.—It is not a physically absolute impossibility, but a moral impossibility; it is impossible to the *sanctified* will.—The indwelling spirit effects so essential a difference among men, that it seems as if they were wholly different races. But because it is invisible, God causes it to become *manifest* in its *persevering* fruit.—How sharply does Holy Scripture distinguish between men; they are either the children of God or the children of the devil; it knows nothing of half-Christians, of an amphibious race; man can only be one or the other.—Be not deceived by this sharp dichotomy, as if it were unkind and uncharitable thus to judge, for it is not taught here that we should thus judge and classify *others* (for that is the prerogative of God), but that we should judge and range *ourselves*.

REINHARD:—Christ takes away

1. The *deception and fraud of sin*—by His *doctrine*.
2. The *punishment* of sin—by His *death*.
3. The *dominion* of sin—by His *Spirit* and *example*.

BESSER:—With God every transgression is a crime; the Judge above does not treat sin as a trifle, a peccadillo (*peccatilio*, a little sin). Every sin and all sin has the character of treason.—True Christians *know* that the Saviour was manifested as the enemy and atoner of sin, and they agree with Him in heart and mind in pronouncing the same sentence on sin which was passed upon it in His bitter sufferings and painful death. Every one that *abides in Christ*, to whom he belongs once for all, *does not commit sin*, but says *no* to sin, which belongs to the old man, and resists its foreign power. The Christian's will, his *ego* resting in and governed by Christ is not one with sin but one with Christ in whom there is no sin. Hatred of sin is the feeling which the children of God have in common, the love of sin the universal dowry of the children of the devil. Just as only those truly love *good* who know *the Good One*, so they only hate *evil* with perfect hatred who hate the *Evil One* as actively engaged in every evil and abhor sin as the work of the beginner of sin.—The will which worketh sin, is of the devil and not of God. Out of the new, divine life-ground laid in the children of God grows up the pure delight in the good and perfect will of God, and whatever is displeasing to the Father (and sin is unrighteousness and wrong) is equally displeasing to the child.

THOLUCK:—*Do not trifle with sin.* 1. Because our *hope is so glorious*. Here the blessed *rights* of children, there the splendour and joys of children; should not he shun sin that hath such a hope? Ingratitude is one of the meanest vices; he that does not experience the necessity of gratitude for benefits received is one of the poorest and most hopeless of men. Christ who burst the chains and shunned no indignity in order to help us, should we not be grateful to Him—by fighting against sin? 2. *Because sin is so culpable.* Sin, did it only hurt *us*, we might get over it, but as it hurts *God*, it becomes a more fearful thing. The true child of God ceases to *commit* sin and greatly grieves at the presence of any and every sin. [A stanza of a German hymn.—M.] Every, even the smallest sin always hits the nerve of the law, unlike the eye, where the skin only and not the ophthalmic nerve needs to be injured; and the sinful lust is followed by the culpable word and the culpable word by the culpable deed. Misfortune is seldom alone and sin even more seldom. To become free from sin is the *life-task* of the Christian. He knows of no care greater than that of getting rid of a *diseased conscience*. Repentance cuts the *nerve* away from the lust of sin.

GEROK:—(on ch. ii. 28—iii. 8). *Of the paradise of the divine sonship.* 1. of the noblè state *of being a child;* 2. of the holy *duty of a child;* 3. of the blessed *children's right* of the children of God.

[V. 7. BURKITT:—The Scriptures speak of doing righteousness in two senses: 1. in a *legal* sense, which consists in an exact obedience and fulfilling of the law; and thus there is "*none righteous, no not one;*" 2. in an *evangelical* sense, which means walking uprightly according to the rules of the Gospel, conscientiously avoiding all known sin, and performing every commanded duty, observing a constant course of holy actions and making it our daily care to please God in all that we do. And it is the duty of every Christian, who would not be deceived as to his spiritual condition, to try himself by this infallible mark: "He that doeth righteousness is righteous;—whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God."—M.].

[V. 8. BP. HALL:—He that gives himself over to the commission of sin, and makes it his willing practice, that man is not of God but of the devil: for it is and hath been, the trade of that wicked spirit, even from the beginning, ever since his fall [?], to sin against God, and to draw others into sin and condemnation with him.—M.].

[SECKER:—Herein is the plain trial of our condition. If we are destitute of "the fruits of the spirit," it is bad; if we find them in our hearts and lives, we have proof enough of its being good, and need never disquiet ourselves for want of any other. Being able to tell the very moment when we became pious and virtuous, is not material, provided we are so now; and happiest of all are they, who remember not themselves ever to have been otherwise. All feelings are imaginary and deceitful, unless they be accompanied with that one, which the Apostle experienced and mentioned: "For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity we have had our conversation in the world." 2 Cor. i. 12. Our Saviour's rule of "knowing every tree by its fruits" Luke vi. 44, is the only sure way to judge of ourselves as well

27

as of others. And though we may perhaps be sometimes at a loss how to judge, or inclined, and even strongly, to fear the worst; yet if this arise not from presumptuous sins or habitual negligence, but merely from excessive humility or weakness of spirits, a modest diffidence will never hinder our future happiness, nor will a bold positiveness ever forward it. Good men may be cast down and bad men elevated without any reason. The former may see much in themselves to dislike; and yet God may see enough of what He approves to accept them: they may experience little joy in serving Him, and yet "walk" more completely "worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing," Col. i. 10, for doing it without the encouragement of a present reward. The latter, on the other hand, may build upon groundless fancies of their own, mistaking them for Divine communications: may be absolutely confident, wonderfully transported, yet find themselves at last fatally deceived. It is not, therefore, by their fears, or their hopes, or their raptures, that men are to judge of their spiritual condition. "Hereby," saith St. John, "do we know that we know God, if we keep His commandments," ch. ii. 3. "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous; he that committeth sin is of the devil."—M.]

[TUCKER:—As therefore we are well assured, that repentance will re-instate us, and that obedience will continue us, in the Divine favour, according to the gracious terms of the Gospel, so let us likewise remember, that he who wilfully and habitually committeth sin, whatever evidence of his new birth or justification, his adoption or acceptance, he may fancy himself possessed of, is actually no other than the servant of sin and the slave of the devil. In short, virtue and vice, holiness and wickedness, Christ and Belial, can never, never unite together. If therefore we design ourselves to be the candidates for heaven, we must endeavour to acquire such qualifications as will render us fit for that holy place. Because unless we really acquire them during the present state, the alternative is dreadful indeed: for he who committeth sin is of the devil. How shocking even to repeat; yet much more shocking to feel! to feel not only for a time but forever! Whereas on the contrary, "he who doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous;" righteous he is, because he will have, not only his manifold failings and imperfections all forgiven, through the mercies of the Gospel-covenant, but even his deliberate sins and offences cancelled and blotted out on his sincere repentance: and what is still more than ever could have been thought of, much less petitioned for, he will find himself permitted to appear before God as "holy, unblameable and unreproveable in His sight," Col. i. 22.—M.].

[VER. 9. PYLE: *Whosoever is born of God*, etc. As if he had said: In fine, while a man preserves his Christian principle, and answers the character of a true member of God's Church, he can never be guilty of deliberate and habitual vice. Make it therefore a sure test to whom a man belongs, in whose service he is listed, and from whom he may expect his wages, whether of God or of the devil, by the good or wicked practices of his life, by his behaviour towards God and towards his brethren.—M.].

[HAMMOND:—The phrase "born of God" is not to be taken here, as to denote the single transient act of regeneration; but rather a continued course, a permanent state, so that a regenerate man and a child of God are of the same meaning, and signify him that lives a pious and godly life and continues to do so. For the phrase "a child" or "a son" of any kind of father, signifies a resemblance or similitude of inclinations and actions; as a child of the devil, Acts xiii. 10; sons of Belial, Judges xix. 22; children of Abraham, Gal. iii. 7. And so generally in this Epistle, he that is "born of God," signifies a man truly pious, an obedient servant of God: and such is the subject of this proposition when of such an one it is said, that "he cannot sin:" not affirming that he cannot cease to be what he is, cannot fall off from the performance of his duty, of the possibility of which the many warnings and exhortations that are given to pious men are evidences, see ch. ii. 1; 1 Cor. x. 12; Heb. iii. 12; 2 Pet. iii. 17; but that remaining thus, a pious follower, imitator, and so a "child of God," he cannot yield deliberately to any kind of sin.—M.].

[WHITBY:—*He cannot sin.* Now that doth not import a good man cannot be overtaken with a fault (Gal. vi. 1). No, even those "little children" whose "sins are forgiven," and who have "known the Father," may and will be obnoxious still to some infirmities and wanderings out of the way. (ch. ii. 1). They may "sin not unto death," and therefore may still have the spiritual life remaining in them (v. 16–18). But the true import of that phrase is this (Ita de Catone Minore Velleius Paterculus: *Homo virtuti simillimus, et per omnia ingenio diis quam hominibus proprior, qui nunquam recte fecit ut facere videretur, sed quia aliter, facere non poterat.* Hist. R. II. 34. *Omnibus humanis vitiis immunis.* Ibid.): That he hath such an inward frame of heart, such a disposition of spirit, as renders sin exceeding odious and hateful to him; so that he cannot entertain the thoughts of doing it, or a temptation to commit it, without the utmost detestation and the greatest horror, and so can very rarely, and only through surprise, or want of due deliberation, or through such violent temptations as prevent or hinder his consideration, be obnoxious to sin; and when he comes to consider of such an action, is presently condemning himself for it, bitterly repenting of it, and for the future watching most carefully against it. Cf. Matth. xii. 34; xvii. 18; Jno. vii. 7; viii. 43; xii. 39; xiv. 17; Rom. viii. 7, 8; 1 Cor. ii. 14; Rev. ii. 2.—M.].

He that committeth sin is of the devil. It is not he who committeth one or more sins of infirmity, for so did Christ's disciples while they were with Him; nor he who committeth one great sin through the power of a strong temptation, of which he bitterly repents, and from which he returns to his obedience; for thus did David and Peter, who yet were not then the children of the devil; *but they who comply with the lusts of Satan and who will do them.* Jno. viii. 44. The other interpretations which are given of these words seem either vain or impertinent, or false and dangerous, and

1. *Vain* is that sense which some put on these

words: "He that is born of God, *non debet peccare*, ought not to sin," or that it is absurd for him to sin; for the Apostle speaks not of what he ought not to do, but of what he doth not. Such is that also of those fathers, who interpret this of him who is perfectly born of God by a *παλιγγενεσία*, or "a resurrection from the dead," for the Apostle doth not speak of what he shall do hereafter, but of what he doth not do at present.

2. *False* seems to be the sense which Origen, Jerome, and Ambrose put upon the words, that "he that is born of God sinneth not, *quamdiu renatus est*, whilst he is born of God, because he ceaseth to be a child of God when he sins; for this is not only confuted by the examples of David and Peter, whose faith under that great miscarriage failed not (Luke xxii. 32), but by the words of the Apostle, 'Little children, if we sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous, and He is the Propitiation for our sins'" (Jno. ii. 1), who yet is only the Advocate for the sons of God. For the same reason I cannot assent to that exposition which saith: "A child of God cannot be guilty of any great or deliberate crime," as Tertullian, *de pudicitiâ* c. 19.

3. *Dangerous* is the exposition of Bernard (*In Septuag.* Serm. 1), that "they who are born of God sin not, *quia etiamsi peccata illis neutiquam imputentur*, because their sins will never be imputed to them;" and of those who think it sufficient to say, "He sins not without great reluctancy, or not willingly, the evil that he doeth being that which he would not do;" for the will of that man, who, after some contest in his soul, yields to the commission of sin, is more strongly inclined to sin than to the avoiding of it, and so is not renewed. Nor doth the Apostle say, he that is born of God sins not willingly, or without reluctance; but absolutely, "He doth not commit sin."

[I conclude with Gataker: "He that is born of God sinneth not," that is: *Vitam a peccato immuneum quantum potest sibi proponit, nec peccato unquam sponte dat operam; si aliquando præter animi propositum deliquerit, non in eodem persistit, sed errore agnito, ad institutum vitæ pristinum quamprimum quantumque potest, festinus revertitur.*"—M.].

---

4. *Brotherly love is the sum-total of the Divine law.*

Chapter III. 10*b*–18.

10*b* Whosoever[1] doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither[2] he that loveth not his
11 brother. For[3] this is the message[4] that ye heard from the beginning, that we should
12 love one another. Not as Cain, *who* was of that wicked one,[5] and slew his brother.
And wherefore slew he him? Because his own[6] works were evil, and[7] his brother's
13 righteous. Marvel not, my brethren,[8] if the world hate[9] you. We know that we
14 have passed from[10] death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not
15 *his* brother[11] abideth in death. Whosoever[12] hateth his brother is a murderer:[13] and
16 ye know that no murderer[13] hath eternal life abiding in him. Hereby perceive[14] we
the love *of God*, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down[15]
17 *our* lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world's good,[16] and seeth his brother
have need, and shutteth up his bowels *of compassion*[17] from him,[18] how dwelleth the[19]
18 love of God in him? My[20] little children, let us not love in word, neither in[21] tongue;
but in deed and in truth.

Verse 10*b*. [[1] πᾶς ὁ—"Every one that." So German.—M.]
[[2] καὶ—"And." So German, and most foreign versions.—M.]

Verse 11. [[3] ὅτι—"Because." So German.—M.]
[4] ἀγγελία A. B. G. K.; ἐπαγγελία C. Sin. and a few, unimportant Codd.—The context admits the sense "promise" only on the artificial interpretation that it is a gift and a happiness to love.

Verse 12. [[5] οὐ καθὼς Κάϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν. German: "Not as Cain was of the wicked one."—Lücke: "Some supply after οὐ: ἀγαπῶμεν, others ποιῶμεν and the like. But in the first case there arises an irony unsuitable in this connection; and in both cases a second supplement becomes necessary, to wit, of ὅς after Κάϊν, which, as the omission of the relative pronoun is in classic as well as in N. T. Greek without example, could hardly be justified. Much simpler is it with Grotius to complete the sentence thus: οὐκ ὦμεν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, καθὼς Κάϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν." Winer: "Properly, there is nothing to be supplied (ὦμεν or ποιῶμεν would not suit οὐ), but, the comparison being negligently expressed, the reader easily adjusts the clauses for himself: *that we love one another, not as Cain was of the wicked one*, etc., shall it or may it be so with us." For further authorities see Lillie.—M.]
[[6] German: "Because his works were *wicked*, but his brother's righteous." It is difficult to determine the right reading, whether it is αὐτοῦ, αὑτοῦ or ἑαυτοῦ (B.) Most probably αὐτοῦ.—The correspondence between Κάϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν and τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν should by all means be brought out.—M.]
[[7] δὲ—"but," not "and," as E. V.—M.]

Verse 13. [[8] German: "Marvel not, brethren," agreeing with Sin. G. K. Rec. al. in omitting μου.—M.]
[[9] μισεῖ. German, Wiclif. al. retain the Indicative mood.—M.]

Verse 14. [[10] German: "We have passed out of death into life."—M.]
[11] Ἀγαπῶν *without* τὸν ἀδελφὸν, A. B. Sin.; *with* it C. G. K., although less authentic, and rather inserted than omitted. [German: omits the words, and renders: "He that loveth not abideth in death."—M.]

Verse 15. [[12] πᾶς ὁ—Every one.—M.]
[[13] ἀνθρωποκτόνος; German: "man-murderer," but better to render, "*man-killer*" (Lillie following Rhemish vers. at Jno. viii. 44), which is free from the extenuating force suggested by the technical use of such words as "*homicide*" or "*man-slaughter*."—M.]

Verse 16. [[14] German: "Hereby have we known."—M.]
[15] θεῖναι A. B. C. Sin. al., decidedly preferable to τιθέναι G. K. al.

Verse 17. [[16] German: "Life-sustenance." *Goods* might be used in that sense.—M.]
[[17] German: "His inwards;" but "bowels" without the supplement "compassion" should by all means be retained.—M.]
[18] ἀπ' αὐτοῦ A. B. C. Sin.; the words are omitted only by several unimportant Codd.
[[19] German: "Abideth."—M.]
[20] μου after τεκνία occurs in Rec. after G. K., but is wanting in the best Codd.—M.]
[21] The Article τῇ before γλώσσῃ is wanting in Rec. Sin., but found in A. B. C. G. K. and most of the Codd. verss. and editions. [German: "with the tongue."—M.]; ἐν, omitted by K., is found in almost all the authoritative Codd., including Sin.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The transition. v. 10*b*.

VER. 10*b*. **Every one that doeth not righteousness, is not of God.**—Thus the Apostle compresses the one, positive, formally taken and described side of the preceding section and having thus fully, concisely and distinctly recapitulated, he now quickly adds the essential characteristic of that righteousness as the leading theme of what follows, viz:

And he that loveth not his brother.—Calvin: "*Hoc membrum vice expositonis additum est.*" It is interesting to compare the progress of thought in this part with that in the first part: this section ch. iii. 10–18 is related to ch. ii. 29 and iii. 1–10 like ch. ii. 6–11 to ch. i. 5 and i. 6—ii. 5; ii. 6, 7, 11: ἡ ἐντολή, ὁ λόγος, ἡ ἀγγελία brotherly love, and ch. iii. 11 the ἀγγελία, ch. ii. 7: ἣν εἴχετε—v. 11: ἣν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς as in ch. iii. 11; the ὀφείλειν ch. ii. 6 and iii. 16; and both times after the example of Christ; respectively disclosing our relation to death and life here (vv. 14, 15) and to light and darkness there (ch. ii. 9–11). But this section draws more on life (Cain and Abel v. 12, poverty and benevolence vv. 17, 18) and reaches more into life.

Πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην refers back to ch. ii. 29; iii. 7, but the omission of the Article renders the idea more general and indicates the leading thought with the self-evident reference to God and Christ. Thus ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι denotes here both to be born of God and to be the child of God. Καὶ before ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ is epexegetical, and explains δικαιοσύνη as ἀγάπη; hence it is neither=*proinde* (Episcopius) nor adds a new particular, something different (Rickli, Socinus, who defines ἀγάπη as Christian virtue excelling Jewish legality); nor is ἀγάπη a part or moment of δικαιοσύνη (Bengel, Spener, Neander, Gerlach), but its "substance and nature" (Huther,* also Düsterdieck). Cf. Rom. xiii. 8-10; Gal. v. 14; Col. iii. 14; 1 Tim. i. 5; Jno. xiii. 34 sq.; xiv. 15; xv. 12, 17. "Brotherly love is the sum-total of all right-doing" (Besser), love is the fulfilling of the law. Ἀλλήλους, in the Johannean passages like ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ here, denotes brotherly love, the love which Christians have for one another; so also in the corresponding sections ch. ii. 9–11 and iv. 20, 21. Ἀδελφὸς is consequently not=πλησίον Luke x. 36 (Ebrard, who sees here a contradiction to Matth. v. 44; 1 Cor. iv. 12, but without sufficient reason; Rickli and others).

The commandment of Christ. v. 11.

VER. 11. **Because this is the message which ye have heard from the beginning, that we should love one another.**—He that loves the brother must be (out) of God, and brotherly love is the deed of righteousness, *because* the commandment is from Him. Ἀγγελία is here =ἐντολή ch. ii. 7. Bengel's remark is only half true: "*liberalissima appellatio, nunquam* legem *appellat;*" ἐντολή occurs often, but νόμος never. But the *message* implies the *commandment* as indicated by ἵνα. The reading ἐπαγγελία, promise, cannot be sustained without a forced interpretation: it is the goodness, power and grace of God that we should love one another. The commandment of brotherly love has been given from the beginning, since the Gospel has been preached, since you have been Christians; it is and remains indissolubly united with the Gospel and Christianity; ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς applies to the *first* and to *all* Christians. Ἵνα denotes the *purpose*, the *work to be done* and not only the *substance* or *contents* of the ἀγγελία (Huther), for the reference is not only to the substance of a commandment, but to a commandment specified by means of the message, which lies in the *message given* as a *task*, a *work to be done*.

The opposite in Cain. vv. 12, 13.

VER. 12. **Not, as Cain was of the wicked one and slew his brother.**—The sentence is imperfect like Jno. vi. 58, and is a *breviloquentia*, of frequent and diversified occurrence in the classics; cf. Winer, p. 646, who cites in a note a parallel sentence from Demosthenes (Mid. p. 415). The comparison is left incomplete, as in animated conversation when there is no room for misunderstanding; there is nothing to be supplied; the reader or hearer knows from the context what is meant. In the present case: Not, as Cain was of the wicked one and slew his brother, (shall it or may it be so with us). [See note 5 in Apparat. Crit.—M.]. Hence it is neither an independent exclamation (Sander); nor need we supply ὦμεν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ (Grotius, Lücke), nor ὃς (Beza, Socinus), nor *sitis* or the like.—Ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ refers back to v. 8 as contrasted with ἐκ

[* Huther in a note [2d ed. p. 163] replies to the objection of Ebrard and Myrberg that this could only apply to our love of God and not to our love of the brethren, that in John's opinion Christian love of the brethren is identical with the love of God, because the Christian loves his brother as one born of God. He suggests also that ἀγάπη might be better defined as the "essential exhibition" of δικαιοσύνη—M.].

τοῦ θεοῦ v. 10*b*. Hence the reference is to the wicked *one*. The sentence specifies the reason of that action, even as v. 8. ποιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν and ὁ διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει are correlates. [The wild notion of the Rabbis concerning the diabolical nature of Cain may be interesting to the student (Zohar in Genes. iv. 1): "*Rabbi Eleazar dixit: Cum projecisset serpens ille immunditiem suam in Evam, eaque illam suscepisset, reqnque cum Adam habuisset, peperit duos filios, unum ex latere illo immundo et unum ex latere Adami; fuitque Cain similis imagine superiorum h. e. angelorum et Abel imagine inferiorum h. e. hominum, ac propterea diversæ fuerunt viæ istius ab illius viis. Equidem Cain fuit filius spiritus immundi, qui est serpens malus; Abel vero fuit filius Adami; et propterea quod venit de parte angeli mortis, ideo interfecit fratrem suum.*"—M.]. The verb σφάζειν denotes *cultro jugulum aperire ut sanguis effluat*, then to kill, in sacrifice, as the martyrs were slain by the ungodly. Rev. v. 6; vi. 4, 9; xviii. 24. Hence the word does not warrant the inference that the knife was the instrument of the murder (Piscator), but rather denotes that the death of Abel was martyrdom inflicted by an ungodly hand, or finely intimates that Cain, in his hatred, offered a sacrifice to his God, the devil. The next clause, at all events gives prominence to the diabolical character of Cain's deed, the eager question "**And wherefore slew he him?**" being promptly answered thus: "**Because his works were wicked, but his brother's righteous.** Τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν answers to ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν, and denotes Cain's whole manner of life" (Spener), of which the murder of his brother was one form of expression, his whole manner of life as well as this specific exhibition of it being identical as to cause and origin—namely the devil. For if the wicked one had not influenced Cain's whole manner of life and if that had not been wholly wicked, he would not and could not have committed this specific act of fratricide. The term πονηρὸς, as distinguished from κακός is very significant. πονηρὸς, from πονεῖν or πόνος, denotes toil or hardship (and is opposed to χρηστός, good, honest, useful, friendly, serviceable) and then malignity, *malignus*; κακός, bad, *malus*, is the opposite of ἀγαθός, good and valuable. Rev. xvi. 2; Sir. xxxi. 4; Matth. vii. 11; xii. 35; v. 11; Luke xii. 35; 3 Jno. 10. The inwardly evil nature is κακόν, that which is inimical, hurtful and displeasing to others is πονηρόν. Ὁ πονηρὸς is the most suitable term to describe the nature of Satan, the enemy of God, His kingdom and His people, as well as the works of the devil's children. The additional clause τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δίκαια the context requires us to refer to ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι, as pointing out that the piety and the walk of the children of God exactly answering to the law of God are loathsome to the anti-divine world. That devilishness continues still Jno. iii. 19; vii. 7; xvii. 14. Hence the monition:

VER. 13. **Marvel not, brethren, if the world hateth you.**—The same idea is already expressed in v. 1 (διὰ τοῦτο); Cain is the type of the κόσμος (ch. ii. 15–17). "*Magis esset mirabile, si diligerent eos.*" (Didymus). The address ἀδελφοὶ in this connection exerts a beneficial influence: John expresses his love of those whom the world hates and this expression contains a ground of their rejoicing and conveys to them the sweet consolation of the fellowship of love. The particle εἰ is and remains=*if;* if it had been the Apostle's object to describe the hatred of the world as actually present, he might have used ὅτι; but he signifies by εἰ that the readers collectively or individuals at the time being, will not in the end have to endure hatred; but the Indicative μισεῖ denotes that the case will doubtless arise. So Mark. xv. 44 (Vulgate falsely: *si jam odisset*); Acts. xxvi. 8; Winer, *Grammar* p. 307; Kühner, ii. 480 sq. Hence Sander, who makes εἰ=ὅτι, S. Schmidt who makes it=*etiamsi*, and Ebrard who explains=if ever the case occurs, are in the wrong, for the reference is to a necessary condition. ["Εἰ denotes neither a doubt nor only a possibility, for it is not only possible but from the nature of the case *necessary*, that the world hates the children of God; only the form of the sentence is hypothetical, not the thought it expresses. Cf. Jno. xv. 18." Huther.—M.].

Amplification of the Antitheses: Love and Life, Hatred and Death; vv. 14, 15.

VER. 14. **We Know.**—In ἡμεῖς John includes himself among those he had just called ἀδελφοὶ and expresses their confident assurance, the world and its hatred notwithstanding, which is and ought to be a source of strength and consolation. The object affirmed in the sequel shows that the reference is to the experience of believers, of the children of God, and not to the Apostles only, (Lyra) or that it is only the conclusion drawn on the ground of a good conscience, (Estius).

That we have passed over out of Death into Life.—The Prefect μεταβεβήκαμεν signifies an action of the past or the past of an action still continuing in the present, in the condition that has been effected: we *are* those *who have passed over*, Winer, *Grammar*, p. 288, 299. The Perfect must not be taken *per enallagen*, for the Future (Schlichting) or the Present (Didymus, Oecumenius), or the verb must not be construed =*jus* or *spem habere ad vitam* (Grotius, Carpzov). Cf. Jno. v. 24: ὁ πιστεύων—μετεβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν. Of course ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν cannot be taken physically but spiritually, but it must be taken as a real fact; it is=γεγεννῆσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ch. ii. 29: for ἡ ζωὴ is the real life, divine, eternal life (ch. i. 1, 2; ii. 17, 25),=the φῶς and the ἀλήθεια (ch. i. 5; ii. 21, 22) of which the children of God are partakers; the θάνατος is the opposite of this life,=the σκοτία and the ψεῦδος, all of which belong to the ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου. The Apostle, therefore, does not speak of a sentiment (Paulus) or *caligo, infelicitas moralis* (Semler), but of relations and conditions, of regeneration, of the new life of the reconciled child of God. This implies that those who have not yet passed over, are still or will be ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ before this transition into life in Christ; hence there is not the faintest colour for the assertion of Hilgenfeld, that the Apostle did share the gnostic view of the original metaphysical difference of men.

Because we love the brethren.—From this conduct we may know that relation, from these acts of brotherly love that state of adoption by God. Hence the former is the first and

this the second and it is false to consider brotherly love as the cause of regeneration or even as a part of justification in order to complete it, and as *conditio gratiose a Deo requisita*, as do the R. Catholics (Estius, Lyra) and the Pelagians (Episcopius). Brotherly love is only the condition of the certainty of the knowledge that we are justified and the children of God, and not the condition of this new life itself. [ζωή and ἀγάπη are really one and the same thing with this difference that ζωή is the *state* and ἀγάπη the *activity* of the believer; from this blissful, eternal life groweth love, and love in its turn worketh happiness and eternal life; hence the Apostle adds—(Huther)—M].

He that loveth not, abideth in death.—As usual (ch. i. 8, sqq., ii. 22, sqq.), the negative is added in a concise, pregnant form. [See note 11 in Appar. Critic.—M]. The statement is quite general "*he that loveth not*," without specifying the object, viz. the brother. The force of the Present μένει should be retained. To be in death is connected, as something permanent, with not loving. They are one in the other, yet not so that the not loving is the cause of the abiding in death, but, as is manifest from the context, so that we may know the abiding in death from the not loving. [The two are identical. Besser, "Where hatred is there is death, where love is there is life; yes, love is life itself."—M.].

VER. 15. **Every one that hateth his brother is a man-killer.**—Πᾶς denotes the universal application of this thought. Not loving is described as equal to hating one's brother. [Not to love=to hate.—M.]; "pure indifference is impossible to the *living* spirit of man" (Huther). Luther rightly observes: *Nova sententia coram mundo, quod non diligere sit occidere.*" Bengel: "*Omne odium est conatus contra vitam; at vita vitam non insectatur; qui odit fratrem, aut illum aut se ipsum vult occidere.*" Lyra (*odisse pejus quam non diligere.*"), Schlichting ("*Qui non amat, nec bene vult nec male; qui vero odit, male vult*"), and others are wrong. Not loving is only the state of quiescence exhibited in acts of hatred. According to our Lord's exposition of the fifth commandment (Matth. v. 21–26) he is an ἀνθρωποκτόνος that hateth his brother. "*Nam quem odimus, vellemus periisse*" (Calvin); hatred is not only a beginning or cause of murder, but a murder in heart, be it a wish, a thought or a purpose or only the passion which afflicts the brother's life without thinking of his death. "*Latro es, antequam inquines manum*" (Seneca). Here is evidently a reference to Cain, v. 12; the case of Cain shows plainly how hatred of one's brother and homicide go together. The word ἀνθρωποκτόνος, only here and Jno. viii. 44, in this place applies to Cain who slew Abel, his brother, in the Gospel to Satan who destroyed, murdered Adam. Notwithstanding this difference, the two passages are connected with each other, the one shedding light on the other. Cf. Lange on John viii. 44; Vol. IV. p. 244 sq.—The devil, having seduced Eve, and Adam through her to sin, to the transgression of the divine law of which death was the penalty fixed by God.—Sin causing mortality is itself a kind of dying, the fall or falling into death [German: The fall of sin, *i. e. the* fall, a fall of death.—M], and sin, born of lust, when it is finished, bringeth forth death (Jas. i. 15); the first sin was a falling from the life created (out) of God into death threatened as a punishment. Thus Satan became the murderer of Adam and Eve in the strictest sense of the word (Wisd. i. 11–18; ii. 23, 24). With the entrance of sin, moreover, there died in Eve the love of her husband whom she had seduced, and in Adam the love of his wife whom he accused to God and on whom he laid the guilt. There hatred and death are again together. In Cain also there was the hatred of his brother united with the murder of his brother, whereby he showed that he was ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου. Cf. Stier, *Reden Jesu*, Vol. IV. 414 sqq.

And ye know that no man-killer hath eternal life abiding in him.—This concludes the thought: μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν v. 10*b* led the Apostle to speak of μὴ ἀγαπῶν v. 14, then of μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν v. 15 and in remembrance of Cain of ἀνθρωποκτόνος; he first said οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ v. 10*b* μένει ἐν θάνατῳ, but here οὐχ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἐν αὐτῷ μένουσαν. Before he said, he is in death, but now, in him is not eternal life, consequently death is in him. The Apostle denies that he "possesses permanently and fully" (Lücke) eternal life and thus denotes the "permanent state of death" (Düsterdieck) of him that hates and kills his brother. The Present ἔχει has respect to this present life; it is not *habebit* (a Lapide). Hence ζωὴ αἰώνιος not the future glory (a Lapide, Bede and others). Μένουσαν certainly intimates the existence of eternal life, of baptism, etc., out of or in the word of God by means of Christian instruction and the Christian family-discipline; for the Apostle speaks of and to Christians. But even such gifts of God are consumed by hatred abiding; hence he loses entirely the possession of eternal life, so that nothing thereof abideth in him; μένουσαν is therefore not an intensified *to be* (Huther), nor must the want of the Article be pressed as if the reference were only to powers of the future world (Ebrard). This the Apostle lays down as an undeniable fact of Christian experience and consciousness (οἴδατε); hence they know it not from the fifth commandment (S. Schmidt) or from the Old Testament with its death-penalty in the case of murderers, spiritually interpreted (Grotius, Lücke).

Description of brotherly love, vv. 16–18.

VER. 16. **Hereby have we known love that He laid down His life for us.**—S. Schmidt: "*Ne quis vel se ipsum decipiat, vel ab aliis decipiatur, exponendum etiam erit, quæ sit vera et Christiana caritas.*" First after the example of Christ. On ἐν τούτῳ cf. on ch. ii. 3; on ἐκεῖνος, vv. 3, 7; ii. 6; ἐγνώκαμεν = *cognitum habemus.* Τὴν ἀγάπην should be taken in a general sense without any further qualification: *love.*—Bengel: "*Amoris natura.*" In Christ may be known love, the being and nature of love. Hence we must not supply τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Carpzov and others), or τοῦ θεοῦ (Grotius, Calov, Spener, al.); the Vulgate (*amorem Dei*) constrains the Romanists to do so. Ebrard's explanation is rather forced: "we have known love as consisting in this," as if we had ἐν τούτῳ οὖσαν, and this were described in the following ὅτι as the predicate and as if ἐγνώκαμεν had only an introductory and secondary sense. Both the form (the position of the words) and the thought (to give His life=love) render

that exposition untenable. The point is that *whereby* love is known: τὴν ψυχὴν τιθέναι (Jno. xv. 13; cf. x. 11, 15, 17, 18; xiii. 37, 38)=*vitam ponere* (Cicero *ad Fam.* ix. 24); this is the highest proof of love; for love imparts her very best, her most precious goods, παραδοῦναι the ψυχή or ἑαυτόν (Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 2); this makes Christ the object of the Father's love (Jno. x. 17). The context required here ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, for our protection; literally over us, who had fallen, were wounded, in danger of perishing from our wounds or in the hands of enemies, fighting against the enemies, protecting us, becoming our substitute and assuming the fight for us: hence it is not exactly identical with ἀντὶ, and yet the two prepositions touch each other in thought "in indissoluble correlation" (Düsterdieck) cf. ch. ii. 2.

And we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.—From the act of Christ's love for us springs a duty towards our brethren, incumbent on us (ὀφείλομεν); the thought is similar to ch. ii. 8, 6. The example of Christ must not be without corresponding works on our part (ch. iii. 3, 7). The essential union of believers to Christ must exhibit itself in the real moulding of their life after the pattern of Christ, in the use of the imparted gifts and the solution of the task assigned to us by the bestowal of that gift. Cf. Jno. xiii. 34; xv. 12, 13; xxi. 18, 19; Rom. xvi. 3, 4.

VER. 17. **But whoso has the world's goods** (*sustenance of life*).

By the adversative δὲ "John denotes the progress from the greater, which is justly insisted upon, to the less, the non-performance of which, therefore, appears as a correspondingly greater violation of the rule just laid down." (Düsterdieck), Ὃς δ' ἂν makes the sentence quite general. The proverb quoted by Grotius: "βίος βίου δεόμενος οὐκ ἔστι βίος" gives the double sense of life, and the necessaries of life, or the means of sustaining life. Cf. Mark xii. 44 (Luke xxi. 4); Luke viii. 45; xv. 30. Col. v. 12. Beza: "*res mundanæ*," "*des biens de ce monde.*" The Genitive τοῦ κόσμου simply points to the sphere to which the βίος belongs, and, according to ch. ii. 17, denotes the profane and worthless character of these goods, as contrasted with the eternal love and the eternal life in Christ. Βίος τοῦ κόσμου is the antithesis of ζωὴ αἰώνιος; the Christian shares the latter with Christ, the former with the world. The reference is not to uncommon wealth, but rather to any kind of property (ἔχῃ, emphatically in anteposition), though it be in limited circumstances, a mere mite, or bread and potatoes. He that hath the means to give and

Seeth his brother have need.—θεωρεῖ pictorially describes the attitude and activity of the spectator; it is not a hasty look, but permanent looking on and into it (Matth. xxvii. 35; Mark xv. 40, 47; xii. 41; Luke xxi. 6; xxiii. 35; Jno. ii. 23; vi. 19, 32; vii. 3; ix. 8; x. 12; xiv. 17; xvi. 10, 16); he has it before him like a picture which he contemplates with calmness and attention, τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχοντα. On the expression and the thought cf. Eph. iv. 28; Mark ii. 25; Acts ii. 45; iv. 35; xx. 34; xxviii. 10; Phil. iv. 6. [He beholds the brother's need with unmoved eye—M.].

And shutteth up his bowels [inwards] from Him.—After the analogy of the Hebrew רַחֲמִים, σπλάγχνα is=καρδία, Prov. xii. 10 and very often in the New Testament. Bengel: "*Cum visceribus clauditur vel aperitur res familiaris. Aspectus miserorum corda spectatorum illico pulsat vel etiam aperit.*" The heart ought to open itself in compassion and sympathy and move and open the hand to communicate; but it is under the aggravating circumstances of his having the means and beholding his brother's need that he shutteth up his heart and turns away from him (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ). The same pregnancy of thought occurs at ch. ii. 28. A similar use of κρύπτειν ἀπὸ may be seen at Luke xix. 42; Jno. xii. 36 *b*. Hence we need neither supply ἀποστρεφόμενος (Carpzov), nor ἀπὸ=*coram* (Socinus). [This was the case of Dives. He *saw* Lazarus flung at his gate, Lazarus desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table, but he desired *in vain;* Dives *saw* him lie in misery; the dogs had pity and sympathized with the poor man, but Dives, who fared sumptuously *every day*, looked with unpitying eye on his brother's distress; he saw in him a *beggar*, not a *brother*. See Augustine, Serm. 178, c. 3, and Massillon's beautiful Lent Sermon on this subject.—M.]—The negative is emphatically expressed with an implied paracletical inference in the interrogative sentence:

How abideth the love of God in him?—A similar construction may be seen ch. iv. 20; Jno. iii. 12; v. 47. The substance of the question answers to v. 15: οὐκ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἐν αὐτῷ μένουσαν, where eternal life not abiding and even not being in him is inferred from the non-existence of brotherly love, while here the non-existence of the love of God is inferred from the same premises. Ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ is our love to God and indicates the motion of eternal life to its fountain, as in ch. ii. 5. This love to God does not abide, where it does not become operative and preserve its vitality in the active exhibition of brotherly love. Hence it is neither *God's love to us* (Calov), nor *the love prescribed by God* (Socinus, Grotius), nor the love which answers to that of God and Christ (S. Schmidt).

Final exhortation. v. 18.

VER. 18. **Little children, let us not love** [German: *that we do not love*] **in word, nor with the tongue, but in deed and in truth.**—The affecting address, τέκνια, denotes at once the geniality and zeal of John; his earnestness is brought out in the rapid, hortatory, all-embracing expression: μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν. The four substantives occur in pairs and as correlates. First: λόγῳ and τῇ γλώσσῃ to describe false love; then: ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ and (ἐν) ἀληθείᾳ. It is important to note that the first pair in the *Dative* indicates only the means by which love is or becomes operative, while the preposition ἐν which by the copula καὶ belongs also to ἀληθείᾳ denotes the element wherein it moves (Jno. iv. 24). The first pair simply denotes the outwardness of a love which only makes use of words and the tongue, while the contrast indicates that it is destitute of *deed* and *truth*, that it is of real activity and in-

ward heartiness which are the characteristics of true love. The Apostle accordingly annexes to λόγος, the word, which possibly might announce or accompany the deed, the emphatic μηδὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ, the Article serving the purpose "*of rendering the expression more conspicuous*" (Lücke); *the* tongue, "*as the member appointed to utter the word*" (Huther); so that love is not simply the word which might flow from the heart and be the instrument of its application, but stops with the tongue, the means and sole instrument of the word which does not proceed from the heart. Therefore λόγῳ is contrasted with ἐν ἔργῳ and τῇ γλώσσῃ with ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.—Ἔργον and λόγος frequently connected together, as in Luke xxiv. 19; Acts vii. 22; sometimes λόγος and δύναμις (1 Cor. iv. 19, 20), or λόγος and δύναμις καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον καὶ πληροφορία (1 Thess. i. 5) are placed in opposition. Bengel: "*Sermone otioso, lingua simulante.*" Lyra says excellently: "*Verbo, facto nihil; lingua fallaci; hic amor non solum, fictitius et vanus, sed etiam proditorius.*" Τῇ γλώσσῃ denotes "the hollow nothingness," "the purely outward babble which without inward truth produces only a hypocritical show" (Düsterdieck). Hence we need not supply μόνον to λόγῳ (Bede, Socinus, Sander and others); and Grotius is also wrong who chiastically [*i. e.* crosswise—M.] opposes: λόγῳ and ἀληθείᾳ, γλώσσῃ ἔργῳ, thus: "Verbo *amat qui prædicat a se diligi proximum, non autem* vere *diligit; lingua diligit qui egenti* dat *bona* verba." Nor is Huther right, who takes τῇ γλώσσῃ and ἀληθείᾳ as epexegetical additions without introducing a difference to λόγῳ and ἔργῳ respectively, as if the two words of each member expressed only *one* idea [He says, to express the idea mathematically, that λόγῳ: γλώσσῃ=ἐν ἔργῳ: (ἐν) ἀληθείᾳ.—M]. Compare ἀγαπᾶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ 2 Jno. i.; 3 Jno. 1, and Jas. ii. 15, 16.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. All the doings (ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην v. 10*b*, ἔργα δίκαια and ἔργα πονηρὰ v. 12) and all the dispositions (ἀγαπῶν v. 10*b* and v. 14, ὁ μισῶν v. 15) of men points to a deeper ground, a fellowship with God or with Satan which is not discernible *per se*, neither to others nor to the respective persons themselves, but discernible by their disposition and doing.

2. The grossest transgression, e. g. the fratricide of Cain, is never alone, but exhibits itself as one of many, as one of a greater complex of manifold transgressions and plainly indicates, that matters must be bad in other respects, because otherwise this would not have happened (v. 12).

3. Like attracts like, unlike repels unlike: love and antipathy are reciprocal. The Christian need not be surprised that the world from which he has separated himself, has turned away and remains alienated from him, dislikes and hates him; it is just so with himself, with this difference, that the world hates to persecute and destroy, whereas the Christian strives to improve and to overcome.

4. Before it can be said: μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου (v. 14), we are ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Consequently:

1. Before such a stepping forth has taken place and without it, no one is a child of God.

2. Such stepping forth is indispensable in the case of any and every one who desires to become a child of God.

3. It is possible to all who are called to become the children of God.

4. The children of God and the children of the world are perfectly alike in kind and nature before the difference connected with such transition sets in.

5. Consider that those who are not yet brethren, may and shall become brethren as well as thou.—Indeed, it is not said *here* how it comes to pass, but it is plainly stated and may be seen at Jno. v. 24, a passage to which the Apostle unmistakably refers here, and from which may be inferred what is said here and well expressed by *Scholiast* II.: τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ δεξάμενοι, of course ἐν πίστει. But we must not by any means say with the *Roman Catholics* that although *faith* produces the *beginning* of our justification before God, yet *the love to God and to our neighbour increases the same.* This love is simply the sign and mark of recognition that our justification has taken place, that we are justified. Augustine accordingly says very correctly: "*Redeat unus quisque ad cor suum; si ibi invenerit caritatem fraternam, securus sit—jam in dextera est.*"

5. The principle affirmed at v. 16 as a duty (ὀφείλομεν) with reference to the example of Christ *that we also should lay down our lives*, is a general one. We must not regard it with the Roman Catholics as a counsel (*consilium*), but view and observe it with Evangelical Christians as a precept (*præceptum*). It applies not only to priests or saints, but to all Christians: "*Ministri verbi non debent fugere in periculo pestis*" (Luther); neither physicians in case of a pestilence, nor parents and brothers and sisters, nor the government in seasons of insurrection, nor soldiers in war, in the fight, before a battle, nor a mother when she has to nurse her child, nor a man when duty calls. This saying, moreover, must not be treated casuistically after the manner of Socinus, who thinks a Christian ought to die for a non-Christian if thereby his soul may be saved, or if the preservation of a brother is more necessary to the common weal than his own; or after that of Ammon (*Sittenlehre* 3, 24 sq.) be set aside, who thinks it right that in common danger of shipwreck, fire or self-defence, men are justified to kill others if they cannot save their own life in any other way. Düsterdieck rightly observes: "Concrete directions respecting the practical application of the principle can only be given in the connection of a complete system of Ethics in which especially the duties of Christian self-preservation and the virtues of Christian prudence and simplicity as well as those of Christian self-denial and Christian courage must be exhibited not as limitations, but as sacred ordinances of the fully valid evangelical principle as described by St. John." As St. Paul says 1 Cor. iii. 22: πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστιν—εἴτε ζωὴ εἴτε θάνατος and at Phil. i. 21 calls: τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος, so the giving up of one's own life in the calling and for the love of Christ is an ἀποθανεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ (Rom. xiv. 8). Cf. Matth. x. 39; xvi. 25.—

6. The duty of beneficence is universal; it relates as much to the rich as to the poor; it is immaterial whether a man has much or little of the

βίος τοῦ κόσμου. The having much or little determines the giving with or without self-denial, with or without deprivation, consequently the giving with ease or with difficulty. But nothing is said here on that head or on the situation of the necessitous, his greater or lesser need, which may be very extraordinary; nor is any thing said of the worthiness or unworthiness of the necessitous. But the remark of Luther has a very important bearing on the care of our parochial poor; he says: "*Vult nos de nostro largiri; non de alieno aut communi, sicut stulti Anabaptistæ faciunt, qui tollunt proprietatem rerum, sine qua non possunt respublicæ consistere.*" *Private charity*, even *personal* charity, is here distinctly referred to. In this connection it must be supposed as ranged under the *fifth* commandment.—Its opposite is *Stoicism* which includes also compassion among the passions to be left off: *σοὶ μὴ ὀργὴν εἶναι, μὴ μῆνιν, μὴ φθόνον, μὴ ἔλεον.*

7. We must not think lightly of the *word* and its instrument, the *tongue*. But as the *mouth-work of hypocrisy* is hateful to the Lord (Matth. vi. 5), so the *mouth-work of brotherly love* is equally hateful to John, since neither the word nor the tongue is in the service of the love of the heart and speaks or is spoken *separate* from the heart and *contrary to* the life in the heart. The friendly utterance of the mouth must and ought to be in the case of Christians the friendly utterance of the heart. Otherwise it is only a *μόρφωσις τῆς εὐσεβείας* without the *δύναμις* (2 Tim. iii. 5). For the contrary see, Matth. xii. 34, 35; Rom. x. 8–10.

8. These concrete particulars of the laying down of our lives, of communicating the sustenance of life and of the love to our brother in deed and in truth plainly and pathetically indicate that regeneration and adoption by God, (ch. ii. 29) if it is a reality, penetrates, as the central life-power the whole periphery of life, so that we read not only of a *εὐσέβεια* but of *εὐσέβειαι*, 2 Pet. iii. 11 and even of the *θεοσέβεια δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν* (1 Tim. ii. 10). For the diversity of good works induced by the faith of the heart makes it evident to others that the Christian sonship is not a show, but power and truth; his conduct towards the brethren *reveals* his relation to God the Father and this relation *produces* such conduct.

[The Apostle's declaration that every one that hateth his brother is a murderer or man-killer embodies the well known ethical principle that the moral quality of an action does not belong to the outward act, nor to the conception of it, nor to the resolution to carry it into effect, but to *the intention*. Hatred in St. John's view, is murder committed in intention, and he that cherishes hatred towards his brother stands convicted of murder before God and at the bar of his own conscience.—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The twofold piety of a child of God; 1. Obedience to the Father; 2. Love of the brethren.—Like the elder brother thou mightest stay with the Father and work in His field, be envious of and take offence at the friendly reception accorded to the younger son by the Father in the parable of the prodigal (Luke xvi). Cain was the elder brother. This applies primarily to the servants of the Church but it applies also to many others. Cain did not hate Abel because of his herds, for he had his fair fields; or because of his parent's love, for he was his mother's pride; or because of personal beauty or any outward, temporal good; but he hated him because of his piety, on account of the favour he found before God.—Cain [קַיִן a lance a spear, a weapon.—M.], called by Eve in feminine rashness her weapon, and in maternal vanity favoured and spoiled by her, made his offering of anything he found without any particular discrimination as to its quality, while Abel, disregarded and neglected, carefully selected the best of the best and presented it as an offering to his God.—Thou art able to take the life of thy brother's body but in doing so thou forfeitest thy own immortal life; thou becomest a man-killer in respect of thy brother's body, but in respect of thyself, a suicide, even a suicide of thy soul; depriving thy brother of his bodily, earthly life, thou deprivest thyself of thy spiritual, eternal life.—Three difficult questions: 1. Canst thou hate those whom God loves? 2. Darest thou shorten or waste the term of grace which God accords? 3. Wilt thou cast from thee the gift of God in thee, eternal life?—Threefold exhibition of brotherly love: 1. Laying down one's life for the brethren at duty's call. 2. Communication of one's possessions to the needy brethren. 3. Friendly and sincere readiness to oblige and aid the brethren.—Three things thou hast for the benefit of others: Body and life, goods and property, hand and heart.

EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS [cap. vi]:—As the soul is in the body, so are Christians in the world. The soul dwells in the body but is not of the body; so Christians also dwell *in* the world, but are not *of* the world. The invisible soul is, as it were, keeping guard in the visible body; this is the mark of Christians as long as they remain in the world: their piety is invisible. The flesh hates and wars against the soul, which (the soul) is, however, by no means wronged [*ἀδικουμένη* = *affecta injuria*.—M.] by it because it (the soul) forbids the indulgence of the lusts of the flesh; so the world hates the Christians, although they by no means wrong it but only resist the lusts of the world. The soul loves the flesh and the members which hate it; so also Christians love their enemies. [Cf. Matth. v. 44.—M.]

BASILIUS:—Because the devil's hatred cannot reach God, he seeks to hurt and destroy man, the image of God.

AUGUSTINE:—The Christian lives, but, as it were, in winter; the root is alive but the boughs look dry; the living pith and marrow is within, and within are hidden the leaves and the fruits—but they wait for summer.

AMBROSE:—"*Nemo dicat proprium, quod commune est; esurientium panis est, quem tu detines; nudorum indumentum est, quod tu recludis.*"

LUTHER:—The world is a den of murderers, subject to the devil. Would we live on earth we ought to be satisfied with being guests therein and putting up at an inn whose host is a roguish host, whose house bears the sign and title over the door: "*Murder and lie.*" For Christ Himself did affix such a sign and title to his house right

over the door by saying that He is a murderer and a liar. A murderer to destroy the body; a liar to seduce the soul.

STARKE:—Because God is Love and loves those who are born of Him, therefore love of the brethren is also the mark of the regenerate.—Art thou tempted with the thought that thou art without the grace of God, without the adoption, without salvation: be of good courage! If thou really and heartily lovest the godly, yea even the wicked and thy foes, thou mayest be quite sure that all these blessings are thy own.—Good Christian, whenever thou readest and hearest some portion of Divine truth, consider well the purpose of God in announcing it and shape thy course accordingly.—Contrary dispositions are not uncommon among actual brothers; the one may be good, the other bad, the one may be saved, the other damned.—The power of Satan over those children is so great that he changes even natural love into hatred.—Mad features of the ungodly! they cannot bear that the works of others are good—why? What is it that envy will not do? They also do not like it because it puts them to shame and sometimes becomes the means of their punishment.—Happy state of believers as contrasted with that of unbelievers! The former truly live, the latter are dead though their body is alive. We mourn for the dead—how much more ought we to mourn for the ungodly, for they are spiritually dead, before they die, and if they die, they fall into eternal death.—God has not only connected the hand but also the mouth and the heart with the fifth commandment.—Hatred is not a trifling sin of infirmity compatible with a man's continuing in a state of grace, but so great a sin as to entail the loss of eternal life, which is irrecoverably lost while hatred lasts. He that hates is a double murderer, he wants to hurt others and deprives himself of eternal life.—To have had life does not render us blessed; but he is blessed with whom eternal life *abides*.—It is one thing to have this world's goods and another to covet them: the one is the blessing of God, the other covetousness.—Poverty is no disgrace: a man may be poor and yet be the child of God, the brother of Christ and of good Christians.—Doing good to the poor is not only incumbent upon the rich, possessed of great abundance, but to every one who has this world's goods and is able to communicate; even as every one has to work, also for this purpose, that he may have something to give to the poor.—Love is blind in not having respect to the person of the poor, whether it be known or unknown, strange or native; but it is not blind in taking cognizance of the need it is to relieve.—Do not always wait for a poor brother's application, begging, supplication and appeal to thy love; many are ashamed to disclose their need; but if thou knowest thy brother's case, show pity unasked and joyfully.—If unable to do anything else, thou canst love with the tongue by words of good counsel and consolation; but see that thy heart be with thy tongue.—The greatness of a benefaction does not determine its worth before God, nor does its smallness lessen it; a great benefaction without sincere love is small, even nothing before God; but a small benefaction prompted by sincere and hearty love is great in God's sight.

NEANDER: As Cain hated and slew Abel in consequence of the contrast between a godly and an ungodly disposition, so the world hates and slays the children of God in consequence of the same contrariety of disposition. Hence the world and the children of God are ever at war like love and selfishness. Hence Christians need not be surprised, if the world hates them. This is to them the stamp of the divine life, the possession of which renders them the opposite of the world.

HEUBNER. Being without love makes men like Cain, whose kind is not extinct. The mind of Cain is to destroy the hated children of God; literary murder also belongs to this head. As to its secret, inmost tendency, all hatred aims at murder.—The duplicity of mankind was prefigured in the case of Cain and Abel; this dichotomy runs through the whole Bible. Cain is the prototype of the evil and unloving, Abel the prototype of Christ.—A Christian *Nil admirari*, Ps. xxxvii. Hatred and enmity is that which disquiets, vexes, excites and disconcerts the natural man most. But the Christian is bidden not even to be surprised at it! He knows the world, is aware of what he has to expect of it, he is at peace with God, lives a life of introversion, is so well rooted and grounded in God, so abundantly satisfied with the grace of God, that the world's hatred does not disturb him. God is his fortress: but he must not leave that fortress.—Where the hatred of the world has not yet fully developed, there is most surely a want of decided Christianity.—Love displays its most glorious beauty under the world's hatred. The Christian loves while the world has no idea of the existence of his love.—Formerly this world was extra-Christian, but now there is a world on the soil of the Christian Church. Is it offensive, hostile, presumptuous to speak of this difference? then it is the fault of the Bible, of Jesus Christ. We ought to hold up a mirror to all: you are either this or that. But it would be presumption to refer individuals to the class to which they belong, for this is the prerogative of God.—*Death* is the state of insensibility and impotence with respect to whatever is good and godly, the conscience is blunted and without receptivity, the heart is dead without any emotion, or interest in religion. *Life* is activity, emotion, a sense for, an impulse to and ability for the holy, a work after the will of God, a state of holiness, of a walk well-pleasing to God. *Brotherly love* is mentioned as a criterion, as a test of life.—Think of hatred as the root and beginning of murder. Often a bitter grief is to others more deadly and vitally injurious than a gross bodily injury.—Distinguish between that which passes with men and that which passes with God.—Never make room for secret anger: or life, the Holy Ghost will depart from thee.—The unloving thinks more highly of lifeless, worthless metal than of the living man created in the image of God.—What can you accomplish with the metal? Refresh the weary, comfort their hearts and dry their tears! Then you transmute stones into bread, earthly treasures into heavenly.—The word is only the shadow of the deed and by no means an equivalent of love or gratitude. (Themistius).

BESSER:—Where hatred is, there is death;

where love is, there is life; yea, love itself is the life.—Thus Luther showed that he was willing to lay down his life for the brethren when in the year 1527 he stayed at Wittenberg with those who were stricken with the plague. So the ancient historian Eusebius narrates how a pestilence at Alexandria brought out the difference between the Christians and the pagans. So *Hans Egede* laid down his life when for the sake of the poor Greenlanders he exchanged his comfortable parish for hunger and cold, for unspeakable toil and sufferings; and the coast of Africa, also, lined with grave-hills with the seed of the negroes proclaims the love which is stronger than death. Would that it might be said of the Christians of our time what Tacitus said of the Christians, viz.: that they are as inflexible concerning their faith, as they are ready in the exhibition of mercy.—How can he live on God's compassionating love in whom no compassionating love does live?

On the Epistle for the second Sunday after Trinity, 1 *Jno. iii.* 15–18.

Heubner, during the siege of Wittenberg, in 1813, preached on the hatred of the world to which Christians are exposed, and said, notwithstanding the presence of the French garrison, when he came to speak of deserved hatred: the hatred is deserved, which visits the tyrant who sacrifices thousands and the welfare of thousands to his lust of rule.

The Christian under the hatred of the world.

1. How dignified is his demeanour in bearing it a. with calmness, composure and patience (v. 13); b. with the consciousness of his innocence, his love, as known to God (v. 14); c. with the hope of being one day justified (v. 2); 2. how holily he uses it: a. as a warning against all the motions of hatred (v. 15); b. as a challenge to become more like Christ in love (v. 16); c. as an instrument to reconcile the world to himself by love (vv. 17, 18).

Motives of comfort for Christians under the world's hatred. 1. (v. 13). They are unknown and misunderstood; 2. (v. 14); they become conscious of their life; 3. (v. 15); they are encouraged to fight against all unlovingness; 4. (v. 16); they resemble Christ; 5. (v. 17); become more and more assured of the love of God; 6. (v. 18); they hope to gain their enemies over.

The mind of the Christian and of the world opposed to each other in love and hatred. 1. To hate is natural to the world, to love to the Christian (vv. 13, 14); 2. Hatred destroys, love sacrifices the life (vv. 15, 16); 3. The world shuts up, the Christian opens the heart (v. 18).

Whither do we come if the spirit of love leaves us? 1. Answer: we come from the fellowship of the saints to the fellowship of the world (v. 13), from the life of God to spiritual death (v. 14), to vice and shame (v. 15), to forfeiting our salvation and the fruits of the death of Christ (v. 16).—2. Application: learn the worth of true love (v. 16), fight against every motion of unlovingness (v. 17), practise love in deed and in truth (v. 18).

The strong warnings given to Christians against an unloving mind.—Love appears most beautiful under the world's hatred.—Love, a sign of life.—It is only by love that a Christian can know whether he is a child of God or regenerate. 1. The truth. 2. The laying to heart being reminded of this truth.

F. A. Wolf:—*The Apostolical refutation of the principal errors prevailing on the subject of Christian love:* 1. The *fate* of love, 2. The *reign* of love, 3. The *value* of love, 4. The *origin* of love.

Caspari:—*Of the nature of true love:* 1. Its consolation, 2. Its powers, 3. Its purity.

Kapff:—*How necessary true brotherly love is*, 1. As a test of our spiritual life; 2. As a condition (?) of eternal life.—*The Law and the Testimony: Of Brotherly Love.* I. Motives. 1. The contrast of Cain; 2. Marks of discipleship and regeneration; 3. The passing away and perdition of the hater. II. Marks. 1. Laying down one's life; 2. Communication of one's goods; 3. Love in deed.

The true life in love and certain death in hatred: 1. The ground, fruit and nature of the true life; 2. Certain death in hatred of the brethren, as to ground and nature.

Brotherly love. 1. Who are our brethren? 2. How do we love the brethren? 3. What moves us to such love?

How operative is the love which flows from the living knowledge of the sacrificing love of Christ! 1. It takes us from death to life; beloved of God in Christ, we love. 2. It alone is able to bear the hatred of the world without ceasing to love (Matth. v. 39–42). 3. It is not only love in words and with the tongue, but in deed and in truth.

We know that we are born of God, for, 1. The world hates us; 2. We love the brethren; 3. We hate hatred, but not the hater; 4. We lay down our life for the brethren.

A heart-test of what spirit we are (Luke ix. 55, 56; Jer. viii. 6). 1. For the satisfaction of the righteous who in their love grieve over the world's hatred; 2. For the terror of the ungodly who hate their neighbour without fear or anxiety; 3. for the awakening of the hypocrites who love their neighbour only in appearance.—*Questions of Confession.*

[Ignatius:—(*ad Smyrn*, 6.): "Observe those who are heterodox with regard to the grace of Christ, how contrary they are to the mind of God. They have no regard for love,—περὶ ἀγάπης οὐ μέλει αὐτοῖς—they do not care for the widow, or the orphan, or the hungry or the thirsty."—M.].

[Wordsworth: (on v. 16).—"*And we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren;*" a remarkable saying on the duty of Christian martyrdom. It was probably suggested by the seductive tenets of the false teachers (οἱ πλανῶντες mentioned 1 Jno. ii. 26; iii. 7), who courted popularity in times of persecution; by alleging that provided a man had *knowledge* of the doctrines of Christianity as delivered by them, and adopted their theories, it was not necessary for him to *expose* himself to any *danger* in the maintenance of the faith, much less to *endure martyrdom and to lay down his life for the brethren:* but that he might freely associate with *the heathen in their worship*, and eat things *offered to idols*. This was particularly the doctrine of the *Simonians* (Origen *c. Cels.* VI. p. 282; Euseb. II. 13), and of the *Nicolaitans* (Rev. ii. 15. Irenæus I. 23) and of the *Cerinthians* (Philastr. *hær.* c. 36).—Tertullian wrote his book called *Scorpiace* against these notions and he refers to this passage in proof of the *duty of martyrdom*, c. 12.—M.].

[MACKNIGHT: (vv. 14. 15):—According to the Apostle in this place, the surest mark, by which we can know our actual state, is to consider whether we possess that characteristic disposition towards our brethren, which the Christian religion enjoins. The high encomiums, passed in this and the following verse on love to mankind, are not to be so understood, as if no virtue but benevolence were necessary to complete the Christian character. The virtues have all such a connection with each other, that they cannot subsist separately. And therefore, if one really loves his brethren, he will not only be charitable to the poor, but he will be just in his dealings, true to his promises, faithful in all the trusts committed unto him. In short, he will carefully abstain from injuring his neighbour in any respect, and will perform every duty he owes to him, from a sincere principle of piety towards God, whereby his whole conduct will be rendered uniformly virtuous.—M.].

[SECKER:—If we do a person no harm, yet if we *wish* him harm, St. John has here determined the case, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." For indeed, hatred not only leads to murder, and too often, when indulged, produces it unexpectedly; but it is always, though perhaps for the most part in a lower degree, the very spirit of murder in the heart; and it is by our hearts that God will judge us.—M.].

[CLARKE: (on v. 15).—This text has been quoted to prove, that *no murderer can be saved.* This is not said in the text; and there have been many instances of persons who have been guilty of murder, having had deep and genuine repentance; and who, doubtless, found mercy from His hands who prayed for His murderers, *"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."* It is, however, an awful text for the consideration of those who shed human blood on frivolous pretences; or in those *wars* which have their origin in the worst passions of the human heart.

(On v. 17).—Here is a *test* of this love: if we do not *divide our bread* with the hungry, we certainly would not *lay down our life* for him. Whatever love we may pretend to mankind, if we are not charitable and benevolent, we give the lie to our profession. If we have not bowels of compassion, we have not the love of God in us: if we *shut up* our bowels against the poor, we shut Christ out of our hearts and ourselves out of heaven.

(On v. 18). There is a good saying in *Yalcut Rubeni*, p. 145, iv. on this point: "If love consisted in *word only*, then love ceaseth as soon as the word is pronounced. Such was the love between Balak and Balaam. But, if love consists not in *word*, it cannot be *dissolved;* such was the love of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the rest of the patriarchs which were before them."—M.].

[TROWER: (on v. 17).—"What a picture is here brought before us, of a Christian possessed of this world's good, and seeing his brother have need; yet turning away his eyes, and hardening his heart against the claims of charity, shutting up his bowels of compassion from him! How unlike Him who, though He was rich, yet for our sake became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich. May we learn more and more that whatever share we enjoy of "this world's good," is intrusted to us as stewards for God; and that all pretence of possessing Christian love is vain, unless we minister freely to the necessities of our brethren what we have so freely received. Hereby alone can we know that we are of the truth, and can assure our hearts before Him."—M.].

[STANHOPE:—The good we would do, but cannot, shall be rewarded; and the evil, which we are disposed to do, though not actually done, shall be punished. Hence, if a man keep malice, though but in his heart, if he wish or rejoice at the misery or harm of his brother, this man is, in the eye of God, and of the Gospel dispensation, a murderer.—If some sudden change befalls my neighbour's fortunes, the diminution of his honour or estate, the blemishing his credit and reputation, and I feel a secret pleasure in such calamities, can it be charity that ties up my tongue from bitterness or slander, or my hands from invasion and cruelty? No, certainly.—He that triumphs in mischief and doth not act it himself; he that is fond of and cherisheth a scandal, but forbears to raise or spread it; it is not religion, but some other consideration, by which even this man is restrained. But alas! how few are there, in comparison, who think themselves bound to stop here! How few who, while they hold their hands from action, make no scruple to give their tongues a liberty of speaking "all words that may do hurt," and so contribute to the disgrace and grief of their injured and afflicted brother! and if they, with these sharp razors, wound and mangle a bleeding reputation, would not the same malice unsheath their sword and thrust it into his bowels, if their own safety, the fear of human laws, or some other prudential consideration, did not bind their hands, which leaves their tongues and thoughts at liberty? For, were religion, were the fear and love of God, their check, they would prevent the very beginnings of malice. This tells us that we must be compassionate and kind; that we must do to every man whatsoever we would that he should do unto us; that but to meditate or delight in evil is a sin, and that no instance of goodness should be wanting which the circumstances of any brother render seasonable for him to receive, and ours have put in our power to give; that a design of making him uneasy is not one whit less murderous and guilty, because not prosecuted in tenderness to one's self, and not to be effected with impunity. Thus God interprets it, and by this rule He will proceed with us; for He declares Himself a trier of the heart, and that in our last great reckoning, "every secret thing shall be brought into judgment."—M.].

5. *The glorious consequences of our adoption by God.*

CHAPTER III. 19–24.

19 And[1] hereby we know[2] that we are of the truth[3], and shall assure[4] our hearts before
20 him. For[5] if our heart condemn us[6], God[7] is greater than our heart, and knoweth
21 all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not[8], *then* have[9] we confidence toward
22 God. And whatsoever we ask[10], we receive of[11] him, because we keep[12] his command-
23 ments, and do those[13] things that are pleasing in his sight. And this is his com-
mandment, That we should[14] [15]believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love
24 one another, as he gave us commandment. And he that keepeth his command-
ments dwelleth[16] in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in
us, by[17] the Spirit which he hath given us.

Verse 19. [1] Καὶ, though wanting in A. B., is found in C. G. K. *Sin.*, many cursives and versions.
[2] γνωσόμεθα with A. B. C. Sin; γιγνώσκομεν G. K.; another reading is γινωσκομεθα, *cognoscemur*. [German: We shall know.—M.]
[[3] German: "Out of the truth."—M.]
[[4] German: "And shall *persuade* our hearts before Him."—M.]

Verse 20. [5] ὅτι, is written by Lachmann ὅ τι, only after A, which reads ὅτι ἄν. [German: "because."—M.]
[6] καταγινώσκῃ is the reading of the best *Codd.* also of *Sinait;* elsewhere καταγινώσκει.
[7] ὅτι before μείζων, B. C. G. K. Sin. is well authenticated [and adopted in the German which reads: "Because God is greater etc."—M.]

Verse 21. [8] καταγινώσκῃ, elsewhere καταγινώσκει, Sin;—κω, is at all events an error of the pen like ἔκπροσθεν v. 19, ἔσσφαξὲν v. 12—Besides A. omits the first, and B. C. the second ἡμῶν, but both occur in G. K. Sin; and B. C. testify for the former, A. for the second.
[9] ἔχομεν well supported instead of ἔχει B, ἔχωμεν, *habeamus*.

Verse 22. [[10] German: "And whatsoever we may ask."—M.]
[11] ἀπ' αὐτοῦ A. B. C. *Cod. Sin;*—παρ' αὐτοῦ G. K.
[12] τηρῶμεν A. K. *Sin.* is probably a slip of the pen for τηροῦμεν.
[[13] καὶ τὰ ἀρεστὰ κ.τ.λ. "And do *the things*, etc.;" the demonstrative pronoun is unnecessary and is not used in most of the versions, the German renders "and do the well-pleasing before Him."—M.]

Verse 23. [14] πιστεύσωμεν B. G. K.—A. C. Cod. Sin. πιστεύωμεν.
[15] ἡμῖν after ἐντολὴν in Cod. Sin. before or after ἔδωκεν in the best authentic *Codd.*

Verse 24. [[16] German: "abideth" to be retained to preserve the uniformity.—M.]
[[17] ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος=of the Spirit; so German.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Transition and first consequence: the assurance of being of the truth.

VER. 19*a*.—**And hereby we shall know that we are of the truth.**—The connection is by the copula καὶ; the Future γνωσόμεθα is occasioned by the hortatory form of v. 18: μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν, the sense being: "If we love ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, we shall know thereby that etc." (Huther); the object of our knowing, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐσμέν, is defined by what is said in v. 18. Thus close is the connection of the Apostle's argument with the preceding section in which he treated of obedience to the commandments of God and more particularly of brotherly love (v. 10—v. 18). Ἐν τούτῳ refers to what precedes, as in ch. ii. 5b., and not to what follows as in ch. ii. 3.—V. 19 is plainly connected with v. 18, not with v. 10 (Rickli, de Wette), or v. 14 (Lucke). The Future has here the same sense as in Jno. vii. 17; viii. 31, 32; xiii. 35, denoting the possibility of a case which may justly be expected to arise. Winer, *Grammar*, p. 294, sq.—Ἐκ ἀληθείας εἶναι requires to be interpreted like ἐκ θεοῦ εἶναι, τέκνον θεοῦ εἶναι both on account of the force of the preposition ἐκ which signifies *principium vel ortum*, and of the pregnant sense which John attaches to the word ἀλήθεια. It is the truth eternal, originating in and springing from God revealed in Christ, testified to by the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of truth, the real substance of the Gospel, and designed to be expressed in the life of believers; it comes nearest to the idea of φῶς, and we ought therefore to compare the term: υἱοὶ φωτός (Jno. xii. 36). Cf. Jno. xviii. 37.—It is not covered by ἐκ θεοῦ εἶναι, but should be combined with it. The truth (out) of God is the nature of those who love the brethren and a well of life in them.—Hence we must not explain with Bede: "*ex veritate quæ Deus est*" (so also Calvin, Rickli and others), or with Calov: "*ex verbo veritatis*" (so also Spener, Bengel, Lücke, de Wette), and still less understand with Jachmann "*the true religion*," or with Nösselt: "*doctrina divina*," or with Semler: "*perfectior vita*." These definitions do not explain the idea ἀλήθεια. Nor must we weaken the force of the preposition ἐκ and explain with Oecumenius: "ἀληθεύειν," or with a Lapide: "*veracem esse, veraciter ambulare*," or with Socinus: "*vere talem esse, ut quis se esse se profitetur*," or with Grotius: "*congruere evangelio*."

Second consequence: An assured heart before God, vv. 19*b*. 20.

VER. 19*b*. **And we shall persuade our hearts before Him.**—Πείθειν either to convince or to persuade; the object καρδίας ἡμῶν points to a difference within the personality, qualified by καταγινώσκῃ and hence perceptible. It is an ethico-religious difference: the accusation and condemnation of our heart against our own person. The Apostle designates by καρδία the inmost seat of the emotions (Jno. xiv. 1, 27; xvi. 6, 22), the source of our actions (ch. xiii. 2), and here also the judge within; συνείδησις in John, occurs only in the spurious passage ch. viii. 9, but is frequently used by Paul (Rom. ii. 15; ix. 1; xiii. 5; 1 Cor. viii. 7; 2 Cor. v. 11; Acts xxiv. 16)

and also at 1 Pet. iii. 16, 21; Heb. xiii. 18. Origen cites v. 21, plainly either as: "ἐὰν μὴ ἡ συνείδησις καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν," or as "ἐὰν ἡ συνείδησις ἡμῶν μὴ καταγινώσκῃ." The Greeks take *καρδία* simply for *συνείδησις*. Although *καρδία* is more comprehensive than *συνείδησις*, yet the latter is contained in the former, viz., conscience is in the heart, which we must conceive to be disquieted and excited by and with the conscience. The connection requires us to construe *πείθειν* aimed at the point "*ut desistant condemnare*" (Bengel), as at Matth. xxviii. 14: *πείσομεν αὐτὸν*, *i. e.*, the *ἡγεμόνα* and *ἀμερίμνους ποιήσομεν* the soldiers on guard who had fled on the morning of the resurrection. According to the context and conformably to usage *πείθειν* denotes a pacifying persuasion. The antithesis v. 21: *ἐὰν μὴ καταγινώσκῃ—παῤῥησίαν ἔχομεν* likewise makes *ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ—πείσομεν* denote to pacify, to quiet as the effect of persuasion. Hence Fritsche's explanation: "*flectemus animos—ad amorem ostendendum,*" is false and wholly repugnant to the context. The reference however is not to the last judgment when the final decision and separation will take place, but rather to the inward transactions, which though prophetical of the last judgment, precede the same during this our earthly life. Accordingly, *ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ* is not *coram illo* in the last judgment and *πείσομεν* relates not to eternity (as Socinus, Lücke, de Wette construe), but only *coram illo,* in His presence, in His light. As the accusing heart on the ground of the Divine word, and in virtue of the impulse of and the fellowship with the Holy Spirit is disquieted, and the voice of God is heard in the conscience, so the heart must be quieted before God, on the ground and in virtue of His word and promise and in the fellowship with Him, so that the following words: "*μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς καὶ γινώσκει πάντα*" explain *ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ*; imaginings of our own spirit and worldly diversions do not promote such quieting. Compare Düsterdieck. Hence we should construe the Future *πείσομεν* in coördination with *γνωσόμεθα* and so connected with *καὶ* that it is also governed by *ἐν τούτῳ*, although the latter connected zeugmatically with *γνωσόμεθα* denotes *thereat*, with *πείσομεν*, *thereby;* this is the more practicable, because *ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας εἶναι* intervenes and completes *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἀγαπᾶν* and *γνωσόμεθα* introduces *πείσομεν*. It is therefore wrong to begin a new sentence with *ἔμπροσθεν* (Paulus, Fritzsche, Ebrard).

VER. 20. **Because, if the heart condemn us, because God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.**—The reading *ὅτι ἐὰν—ὅτι μείζων* is so well established that neither a conjecture like that of Stephanus, who proposes to read *ἔτι μείζων*, nor the cancelling of the second *ὅτι*, as done by Grotius, warrants us to lessen or remove the difficulties which are also rather contained in the thought. We have now the reason specified that we shall quiet our hearts before Him in case our heart should condemn us and find a verdict against us. Hence *ἐὰν* with the Subjunctive is perfectly right. Winer, *Grammar*, pp. 307, 308.—"*Καταγινώσκειν* stands midway between *κατηγορεῖν*, to accuse (Rom. ii. 15), which is still accompanied by an *ἀπολογεῖν* (Rom. ii. 15), and *κατακρίνειν*, to sentence [in a bad sense—M], condemn (Jno. viii. 10 sq.); the latter includes the judicial punishment (Jno. viii. 10; Col. iv.), while *καταγινώσκειν* denotes only the verdict found against a person accused to be followed by the punishment corresponding thereto. Cf. Deut. xxv. 1, 2. The term is therefore very significant with respect to the verdict found by our own soul against ourself, which is more than the mere accusation, because the *καταγινώσκειν* implies also the guilt of the person accused, so that the condemnation to the punishment, the *κατακρίνειν*, may justly be expected" (Düsterdieck). In the heart there is not only a party, but also a judge; the conscience is a court of justice. Hence it denotes here not only *reprehendere* or accuse (*Vulgate*, Augustine, Lücke, al.). Why the heart finds a verdict against us the context indicates "in a relative play on the words" *γνωσόμεθα—καταγινώσκῃ*, exactly like Jno. xv. 2. (Düsterdieck). Consequently [it finds the verdict against us—M.] that we are not wholly of the truth, that we do not perfectly, gladly and uninterruptedly love the brethren; for these are correlates of extraordinary difference in degree up to perfection. The explanation of the Greek commentators, who think of v. 18, and that of Düsterdieck, who connects it with v. 19, should be combined against those of Luther and Nösselt, who think of every defect except that of brotherly love; but every other defect would also show itself with respect to brotherly love, and render it deficient. Of course, the reference cannot be to a complete relapse, to a knowingly and grossly repeated case of untruthfulness in love or of unlovingness, since the lying words of love would have no corresponding deed (Estius, Episcopius, Lücke, al.) though we may and should think not only of lesser but also of graver offences, seeing that the conscience of Christians is sufficiently tender and acute to find an adverse verdict also with respect to lesser defects of love. The repetition of *ὅτι* before *ἐὰν* and *μείζων* is not peculiar to this passage but occurs also at Eph. ii. 11, 12. Lücke cites an example from Xenophon, Anab. 7, 4, 5 and 5, 6, 19 remarking, however, that while *ὅτι* in both places signifies *that*, it denotes here "*because.*" The reason of the epanalepsis is not the forgetfulness of the author, but the importance of the thought which allows and requires such a rhetorical emphasis. Lücke admits the epanalepsis without hesitation, Winer, (*Grammar* p. 604, note 3,) is undecided, Huther hesitates and decides against it, the older and many modern commentators (Calvin, Wolf, Sander, Düsterdieck) are for it. There is hence no reason to read with Bengel, Baumgarten-Crusius, Lachmann, *ed. maj.* and others *ὅταν* or *ὅ τι ἐὰν=quicquid* like *ὃ ἐὰν* in v. 22 instead of *ὅτι*. It cannot be maintained with Düsterdieck that this is not Greek, and from the circumstance that *ὃς ἐὰν* or even *ὅστις ἐὰν* never occcurs in the New Testament without the variant reading *ἄν*, while *ὅστις ἄν* frequently occurs without a variant reading, it cannot be inferred that *ὅ τι ἐὰν* cannot be read here. Cf. Winer, *Grammar*, p. 322, sq.—Matth. viii. 19 *ὅπου ἐὰν* occurs without the variant reading *ἄν*, and *ὅστις ἐὰν* is as well authenticated as *ὃς ἐάν*. But on that account it is only possible to read here *ὅ τι ἐὰν* which is occasioned by the reading *ἄν* in A; *καταγινώσκειν*, which may have its object in the Accusative, also

allows that reading. But the context forbids it; for it is hardly true that we can quiet our heart at *every* accusation, and the reason of such quieting to be connected with πείσομεν is too much separated, while the putting and assumption of the case, as stated in v. 20, and required at v. 21, in which the heart stands in need of such quieting, is all but wiped out.—The main difficulty is, that in the circumstance of God being greater and knowing all things must be found, and that it really contains, a quieting of the heart under its accusations.—The word μείζων is of frequent occurrence in the writings of John; in a similar connection at ch. iv. 4; v. 9; in other connections, particularly at Jno. iv. 12; v. 36; viii. 53; x. 29; xiii. 16; xiv. 28; xv. 20. The context invariably supplies the sense in which it is used; here the sentence καὶ γινώσκει πάντα furnishes the necessary explanation; He γινώσκει, while the heart καταγινώσκει. "*Dulce paregmenon in Græco*" (Bengel). God is here called greater in comparison with our heart; the heart accuses: it is not that He accuses more than our heart, but that He judges differently, more justly than our heart; for He knoweth *all* things which our heart does not perceive, know or observe in giving sentence. Πάντα of course points into the heart itself and to the immediate surroundings; what is that? The context answers that question: v. 2: οὔπω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα, v. 9: σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, we do not altogether know ourselves, we have only the beginnings and germs of the life from Him; Christ, His life, His bearing and taking away sin (vv. 5, 6), His destroying the works of the devil (v. 8), objectively completed, but subjectively to be gradually completed from a life-principle of the regeneration (ch. ii. 29), and moreover passing through man's own weakness and sin (v. 3: ἁγνίζει ἑαυτὸν), and through the hatred of the world (v. 13: μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος). God knows the whole (πάντα) of the new life of man even to the ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα (v. 2), while man knows only the particular, the particular error of which the heart accuses him; God knows the power of His gift to man and its preservation in penitence, its growth and development both in the hope and the faith in him. Therefore God is greater and knoweth all things; therefore, this greatness of the God who is our Father is a ground of quieting when the heart accuses us, and in its vitality and tenderness finds a verdict against us. So Besser: "Our heart knows some things and pronounces against us: God knows all things and pronounces not against us, but for us, because the seed of the truth out of which we are born, is not concealed to Him." He knows, as Sander says, even the smallest spark of faith in the glimmering wick, or even the hidden germs of true love (Rickli). "*Conscientia pusilla est et scit aliquid nostri duntaxat, at Deus magnus est, novit omnia nostra, præsentia, præterita, futura, et omnium, et habet jus voluntatemque condonandi*" (Bengel).—Hence this verse is, *sensu evangelico*, to be understood of the love which *forgives* and *destroys* sin (Luther, Spener, Bengel, Besser, Düsterdieck, Huther and others), and not *sensu legali*, of judging righteousness and omniscience (Calvin, Beza, Socinus, Grotius, Calov, Lücke, Neander, Ebrard and others). Ebrard begins a new sentence and explains thus: And before the face of God we shall *convince* our heart, mind, conscience, not the understanding, *that* if (already) our (easily deceived smaller) heart accuses us (that we do not practise love), God, the Omniscient, is greater than our heart (and that we so *much the less* can stand before Him, have παῤῥησία).—Nor must we construe: For, if the heart accuses us, because God is greater than our heart, He also knoweth all things; so de Wette *sensu legali*, Brückner *sensu evangelico*. Rather the importance of the thought justifies the epanalepsis of the ὅτι.

Third consequence. Filial confidence. vv. 21, 22.

VER. 21. **Beloved, if our heart condemn us not.**—'Αγαπητοί as in ch. ii. 7; iii. 2; iv. 1, 7, 11 is here connected with the enjoyment of the forgiving love of God in order to bring out a new and other feature. The recurrence of the words ἡ καρδία καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν indicates the connection with the foregoing (although, as Bengel maintains, καρδία, v. 20, καταγινώσκῃ has the emphasis), in the same sense, in order to mark a particular case (ἐὰν with *conjunct.*), which is sure to arise, and only the negative μὴ marks the antithesis; the word used is μὴ and not μηκέτι, which would make the supposed case the consequence of what goes before (as Huther supposes). A similar construction occurs at ch. i. 8, 9.

We have confidence towards God.—The words παῤῥησίαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἔχομεν denote the state of the peace of the soul and of undisturbed confidence to God-ward which is opposed to that described before by πείθειν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, like at Rom. viii. 15. The παῤῥησία ch. ii. 28; iv. 17 is indeed the child-like free confidence before the Father in the time of judgment; the reference here also is to a judgment, in the court of the conscience, in one's own heart, but not to the future and final judgment. Hence Estius explains falsely: *fiducia evadendæ damnationis in die judicii.* But the limitation of παῤῥησία to confident prayer and supplication is neither warranted by the word itself (2 Cor. vii. 4), the context, nor the construction with πρός, which simply indicates the direction and relation as in Rom. v. 1: εἰρήνην—πρὸς τὸν θεόν, nor by the parallel-passage at ch. v. 14. Here it denotes joyful confidence to God-ward at every moment of life (Rickli, Düsterdieck and others), but not *fiducia in nostris necessitatibus recurrendi ad ipsum* (Lyra), or the girdle or mendicant's bag of all manner of necessaries (Luther), *fiducia in rogando* (Bengel). [Alford: "To God-ward, in our aspect as turned towards and looking to God.—It must be remembered that the words are said in the full light of the reality of the Christian State,—where the heart is awakened and enlightened, and the testimony of the Spirit is active: where the heart's own deceit does not come into consideration as a disturbing element."—M.]. But hereby it is not denied that the specific, yea the most significant feature of this filial confidence (Düsterdieck) is, what follows—

VER. 22. **And whatsoever we may** (perchance, German: *etwa*) **ask, we receive from Him.**—The conjunction καὶ connects a particular already contained in παῤῥησία like καὶ in v. 10*b* (Düsterdieck). Ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν is to be taken quite generally and to be limited only by the subject asking, namely *the child of God* and his

wants (Düsterdieck, Huther). [The latter beautifully adds: "*The child of God* asks for nothing which is contrary to the will of his Father"—M.]. The same holds good of λαμβάνομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (θεοῦ). The Present must not be taken for the Future (Grotius); it rather denotes the present, constant intercourse between the child of God with his God. Cf. Jno. xiv. 13; xvi. 24. Augustine: "*Caritas ipsa novit, caritas ipsa orat, contra hanc aures claudere non novit, qui illam dedit; securus esto, caritas roget, et ibi sunt aures dei; non fit, quod vis, sed fit, quod tibi expedit.*"

Because we keep His commandments and do the things which are pleasing in His sight.—Here is evidently a parallelism: ἐντολὰς—τηρεῖν and τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, so that the two together constitute one idea. At Jno. viii. 29, τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ occurs in a connection similar to the present. Besides this also in Acts vi. 2; xii. 3.—The term εὐάρεστός of frequent occurrence in the Pauline writings (Rom. xii. 1; xiv. 18; 2 Cor. v. 9; Eph. v. 10; Phil. iv. 18), with the Dative τῷ θεῷ or τῷ κυρίῳ is used Col. iii. 20 of the fourth commandment, and the parallel passage Eph. vi. 1, has δίκαιον. Cf. 1. Tim. v. 4: ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. Hence we must also connect τὰ ἀρεστὰ with the commandments. But while the first clause of the parallel sentence specifies the commandments, the second clause marks that which is pleasing in His sight and the kind of obedience, because God requires not a slavish service, but filial obedience, and that an active one (ποιοῦμεν). Hence we must not explain with the Roman Catholic expositors ἐντολαὶ of *præcepta* and ἀρεστὰ of *consilia evangelica.* The greater difficulty is the right construction of the connection with ὅτι, which indicates the reason why our prayers are heard. But the ground is not necessarily *causa meritoria* as the *Greek* writers think who assume an ἀντιδιδόναι on the part of God; and the *Roman Catholics* and the *Rationalists* of course agree with them. The context, especially with respect to ch. ii. 29; iii. 6, 9, 23, 24, shows that while prominence is given to their conduct the reference is to the relation in which they stand, or with the description of their activity to the ground on which they move. The relation between God and themselves which conditions and regulates their conduct is the cause why their prayers are heard, because their conduct conditioned by that relation also regulates their prayers according to the will of God (κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ch. v. 14); the prayers as they are made, so they are heard, because we are the children of God. The expression of Hunnius, that the particle ὅτι is not *causalis* but *rationativa,* is beside the mark, although the idea is correct. Cf. Düsterdieck. [Huther has *multum in parvo:* "ὅτι in close connection with the immediately preceding λαμβάνομεν indicates the ground of the Divine exhibition of love in hearing prayer; this ground, which must not be taken as *causa meritoria,* is the filial obedience of the person asking, whereby God identifies him as His child; the idea of obedience is expressed in two coördinated sentences (resembling the Hebrew parallelism); τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ and τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ are synonymous; ποιεῖν marks the obedience as being *active;* the second sentence points to the circumstance that it does not consist in servile subjection to the *commandment,* but in the filial performance of that which is *well-pleasing* to God." Alford, adverting to the Romish misinterpretation, excellently expounds: "Out of Christ, there are no good works at all: entrance into Christ is not won or merited by them. In Christ, every work done of faith is good and is pleasing to God. The doing of such works is the working of the life of Christ in us: they are its sign, they are its fruits: they are not of us, but of it and of Him. They are the measure of our Christian life: according to their abundance, so is our access to God, so is our reward from God: for they are the steps of our likeness to God. Whatever is attributed to them as an efficient cause, is attributed not to us, but to Him whose fruits they are. *Because* Christ is thus manifested in us, God hears our prayers, which He only hears for Christ's sake: *because* His Spirit works thus abundantly in us, He listens to our prayer, which in that measure has become the voice of His Spirit. So that no degree of efficacy attributed to the good works of the child of God need surprise us: it is God recognizing, God vindicating, God multiplying, God glorifying His own work in us. So that when e. g. Corn. a Lap. says, "*Congruum est et congrua merces obedientiæ et amicitiæ, ut si homo faciat voluntatem Dei, Deus vicissim faciat voluntatem hominis,*" all we can reply is that such a duality, such a reciprocity, does not exist for Christians: we are *in God,* He in us; and this St. John continually insists on. We have no claim *ab extra:* He works in us to do of His good pleasure: and the works which He works, which we work, manifest before Him, and before all, that we are His children."—M.].

Fourth consequence: Fellowship of the Spirit with particular reference to the ground of these consequences, vv. 23, 24.

VER. 23. **And this is His commandment.**—Ch. i. 5: καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη. Καὶ is simply copulative and connecting with τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ specifies the most essential contents of ἡ ἐντολή, which indeed embraces two commandments, faith and love, but which two commandments, being indissolubly united, contain the sum-total of the being determined by the Divine Will in Christ. Ἐντολή refers neither to the first commandment (J. Lange), nor must it be construed in a sense it does not bear (de Wette); it is and remains the expression of the Divine Will (Düsterdieck). Αὐτοῦ of course is=τοῦ θεοῦ. [Oecumenius: ἔχοντες ἐντολὴν, ἵνα τῇ πίστει τῇ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησ. Χρ. ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους. Bede: *Singulari numero mandatum præmisit, et duo subsequentia adjungit mandata, fidem scilicet et dilectionem, quia nimirum hæc ab invicem separari nequeunt. Neque enim sine fide Christi recte nos alterutrum diligere, neque vere in nomine Jesu Christi sine dilectione possumus credere.*—M.].

That we should believe on the name of His Son Jesus Christ and love one another.—Here ἵνα indicates the *purpose* and not only the *contents* of the commandments, as Huther explains [But the strong *telic* sense of ἵνα can hardly be pressed here; see ch. iii. 1, 11.—M.]. The Aorist πιστεύσωμεν is not only the best authenticated and *difficilior lectio,* but also more

thoughtful than the πιστεύωμεν formed after the pattern of ἀγαπῶμεν, and denotes by the side of the Present ἀγαπῶμεν, that the former precedes the latter, πίστις as the pre-supposition, not as being done once for all (against Düsterdieck), but as a root of vital strength, and ἀγάπη as the stem, as in Gal. v. 6: πίστις ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐνεργουμένη, or 1 Tim. i. 5: ἀγάπη—ἐκ πίστεως. Faith conceived as an ἔργον θεοῦ (Jno. vi. 29) and Jno. xvi. 9 (ἁμαρτία, ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ) as the ground of a holy being, of the whole obedience, is yet man's *work* and hence may be required in the commandment, more especially since the construction πιστεύειν τινι (Jno. iv. 21; v. 24, 46, 47; viii. 45) denotes the *assensus* with which man's agency awakes, while πιστεύειν τινα describes the received *notitia*, and πιστεύειν εἰς τινα the God-wrought *fiducia*, which embraces the least, the *notitia*, and also the moment next to it, the *assensus*. The object of faith is τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This ὄνομα is the revelation of the being of the Son of God, and contains within itself and discloses to believers what is testified of Him and by Himself, and is to be testified; it includes both the *prædicatio* (Rom. x. 14) as Calvin and Beza explain, and the *meritum* and the *promissiones Christi et de Christo*, as pointed out by S. Schmidt and others. *Doctrina Christiana* (Episcopius), and *the dignity of the Messiah* (S. G. Lange), are consequently insufficient. [Alford: "To believe the Gospel-message concerning Him, and Him as living in it, in all His fulness."—M.]. Conformably to the close connection of faith and love (Jno. xvi. 4, 7 sqq.) the Apostle now annexes the Present ἀγαπῶμεν to the Aorist by the copulative καί.—The additional clause—

As He gave us commandment, being a further qualification of love (ch. ii. 7, 8; iii. 16; Jno. xiii. 34; xv. 12, 13), belongs to the latter part of the sentence (Myrberg: *non modo amandum est, sed etiam vere et recte amandum*), and not to the former (πιστεύσωμεν), as Estius, Bengel, Sander.—Hence Christ, and not God, is and remains the subject of this lateral idea. Christ, on whom, as the Son of God, we have to believe, is the origin and standard of brotherly love.

VER. 24. **And he that keepeth His commandments, abideth in Him and He in Him.**—Passing over the lateral idea and the ἐντολή, v. 23, and resuming the ἐντολὰς τηρεῖν, v. 22, the Apostle now makes prominent the fourth consequence, the fellowship of God with us and our fellowship with God, according to which He is in us and we are in Him. Hence αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ, αὐτὸς—all three—describe God and not *Christ* (Neander, Besser, Sander).

And hereby we know that He abideth in us, from [out of] the Spirit that He gave us.—God's abiding in us is the object of knowledge; and it is important to notice that God's abiding in us is not specified here as *res minus verisimilis* (Socinus), but as the condition of our abiding in God; the two mutually include each other and must be taken in that sense. And this is known ἐν τούτῳ=ἐκ πνεύματος. Ἐν τούτῳ obviously refers to what follows, as ch. ii. 3, and not to what precedes, as ch. ii. 5. Surprising is the transition from the formula ἐν τούτῳ, placed at the beginning of this sentence and so current in John, to ἐκ πνεύματος, but the transition may be explained by the circumstance that after ὅτι μένει ἐν ἡμῖν the clearness and beauty of the structure required substantive proof, and that this substantive proof occasioned the fine and thoughtful description of the source and origin of that knowledge by the preposition ἐκ. Cf. ch. iv. 6: ἐκ τούτου γινώσκομεν. The πνεῦμα is the Holy Spirit who moves us, the living and powerful principle of our life from (out of) and in God. Here we should remember the χρίσμα, ch. ii. 20–26. Inadequate is de Wette's explanation, that πνεῦμα denotes the Divine appropriated in faith and life, but that the reference here is to the right knowledge and doctrine of the person of Jesus, and even more inadequate is the opinion of Socinus, that πνεῦμα is love.—In the annexed relative sentence οὗ must not be taken as a *genit. partitivus*, but as the result of attraction. Winer, Part III. § 24.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Christian should *not be or remain in a state of uncertainty* whether he really is a child of God (out) of the truth; his redemption and the reconciliation of God to him and his reconciliation to God and his salvation need not be to him a doubtful or only probable state. But clear and firm knowledge on this subject he does not acquire at one stroke, over-night; he must learn it by living and exercising himself in love. The Christian in process of being [*i. e.*, in the development of this Christian life—M.] is in a state of fermentation, or engaged in single combat, without a survey of the whole field, the battle conducing to victory, although here and there defeats occur, and he is forced to retire even unto flight—without being able to imperil the ultimate victory. Hence he has misgivings which he can and ought to discard, fearless and full of confidence and reliance on the Lord of hosts and of the victory.

2. *The final cause* of such assurance of faith and blessed certainty of salvation, constantly exposed to the danger of being disturbed by the accusations and charges of the heart discerning and reproving the ever-recurring omissions and imperfections and transgressions in thought, word and deed, lies not in ourselves, neither in the mark, in brotherly love and, generally, in obedience to the commandments of God, nor in such acts of reproof of an anxious and contrite heart, but in God Himself, in that which He has promised and imparted to us, and that He abides by His word and work, also in our hearts, nursing and furthering the same even unto completion. Three things are clearly and distinctly asserted.

a. If the Christian looks at himself, anxiety and doubts concerning the state of grace are justified; Heb. vi. 4–6; x. 26–31, in which passages Luther found "a hard knot," and on which see R. Stier, point to the possibility of a relapse, as also Rom. viii. 13; Gal. vi. 7, 8. This is contrary to Calvin's assumption of the *donum perseverantiæ* given with regeneration, and which is not taught at Jno. x. 28, 29. But if the Christian looks up to the mercy of God, he acquires confidence and joyfulness and the Holy Spirit bears

witness of his adoption and Divine life-fellowship (v. 24, Rom. viii. 16–27). This is contrary to the Roman Catholic doctrine except by that the Christian, special revelation, *cannot* have any certainty concerning his state of grace.

b. The point in question is not a mathematical *certitudo*, an *actus intellectus*, but only *fiducia* as well as confidence in the pureness of a man's disposition.

c. The certain assurance of standing in God's grace is not identical with nor to be confounded with the certainty of being predestinated. The *Council of Trent* was right, in opposition to the Reformed, to reject this certainty (vi. 15, 16) but wrong in rejecting the former assurance (vi. 9): "*Sicut nemo pius de Dei misericordia, de Christi merito deque Sacramentorum virtute et efficacia dubitare potest, sic quilibet, dum se ipsum suamque propriam infirmitatem et indispositionem respicit, de sua gratia formidare et timere potest, quam nullus scire valeat certitudine fidei, cui non potest subesse falsum, se gratiam Dei esse consecutum.*" Here, as we may readily perceive, truth and falsehood are suspiciously mixed up. Cf. Frank, *Theologie der K. F.* 2. 78, 141. Thiersch, *Vorlesungen über Protestantismus und Katholizismus*, 2, 149–159.

3. The two cases that conscience finds a verdict against us and not against us are opposed to each other, but nevertheless facts belonging to the Christian life and perfectly compatible with it, even as ch. i. 8, 9 and ch. iii. 9 do not cancel each other. These propositions cannot be classed among the paradoxes, which may not be without truth, as stated by Luther, e. g. "*Si in fide fieri posset adulterium peccatum non esset*," and Proposition 32 in *Grund und Artikel*, which were unjustly condemned by the Romish bull (1520, Erlangen, 24, 138): A good work done in the very best manner, is still a daily sin, etc.—Nor dare we try to aid the establishment of a morality for the people, and another morality for the saints by drawing with the Roman Catholics a distinction between *præcepta* and *consilia evangelica*, between a selfish *amor concupiscentiæ* calculating on salvation and an *amor amicitiæ* surrendering itself in pure fidelity. We may neither separate by false distinctions the objectively given commandments with the will of God nor the subjectively imposed obligations, nor, worse still, men from one another. But we ought to contemplate both truths, that our natural disposition which is sinful before God ever and again mingles without, and contrary to the Christian's will with the works done by the motions of the Spirit from above and in faith, and that the Christian born of God has before his eyes and in his heart the one will of God, as revealed in the Law and in Christ, which aims not at a higher or a lower morality [but at one morality—M.], and that his obedience is well-pleasing to God, not because of his own doings or nature, but solely for the sake of Christ. Our life here on earth is made up of alternate joy and grief, of rising and falling, of forgiveness of sins and cancelling and the commission of sin. Sin, moreover, is more sinful in the children of God than in the servants of perdition, for they have a more profound and lively sense of the slightest stirrings of the wrath of God, because and though their falling is not yet a falling from grace, as at Gal. v. 4 (τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε). Not every falling involves the loss of grace. But obedience and patience in good works remain marks of the state of grace. Cf. C. A. 6, 20, f. C. 4, 5, 6, Frank 1, 1; 2, 177 sq.; 181 sq.; 189 sqq.; 369 sqq.

4. Filial confidence which does not begin with the entrance upon our inheritance [but here on earth—M.], has a παῤῥησία not only in the day of judgment, but already here on earth, and it evidences itself both by zealous efforts towards self-sanctification based on the assurance of the forgiveness of sins, and by confident prayer. "Prayer is as essential to man as his conscience, because the conscience, in proportion to its clearness and vitality, necessarily passes into prayer" (Löber, *Lehre vom Gebet* p. 1.). If the conscience is pacified, prayer will be sure of being heard. If man is so circumstanced that he lives and moves in God's word, his word in prayer to God will also prevail with God, in whose being (as we may learn from the case of the praying God-man), as well as in man's being prayer has its ultimate reason. Harless, therefore, has not very judiciously classed *prayer* among the *subjective means* of Christian virtue (*Ethik* §. 38).—A limitation of prayer that may be heard beyond the pattern-prayer of the Lord's Prayer is not permitted; you may in the state of grace pray for every thing assured of being heard, but equally assured that nothing is said of the time when and the manner how your prayers will be heard. God hears whatever we ask, but not exactly as we ask.

5. Faith in God, who is Love, and (in virtue of our belief in the love of God) love of the brethren are intimately connected, the reference being to "faith as the transition from darkness to light and love as the walk in the light" (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* XI., 2, 337, cf. v. 14).

6. It follows from the testimony of the Holy Spirit within thee (cf. No. 2 above), that thou art a *temple* of God (1 Cor. iii. 16), or a *tabernacle* of God among men (Rev. xxi. 3).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Much depends on knowledge, more on knowledge of the truth, most on the knowledge whether we are ourselves of the truth.—He is to be pronounced happy in whom the difficult self-knowledge was acquired and carried out as the knowledge of sin, but more happy he in whom the knowledge of God forces itself through the knowledge of himself.—Four marks of our adoption or four evidences of our being of the truth: 1. Peace of the soul under the accusations of conscience (vv. 19, 20); 2. Filial trust under the wants and deprivations of life (vv. 21, 22); 3. Assurance and decision under the manifold and different requirements (x. 23); 4. Joy of fellowship in solitude or desertion.—How can you pacify your heart disquieted by the accusings of conscience? 1. Know what God has hitherto done for you not in vain: He desires to save you; 2. Feel how in such a judgment the holiness of

God is working in you: He desires to purify you; 3. Hope that He will gloriously accomplish it, as He has promised: He is the Master and your life will be a masterpiece *at the last.*—Prayer and commandment are essentially related to each other; thy word addressed to God in *prayer* will surely be heard, if God's word addressed to thee in the *commandment* is observed. God will not be *asked* in vain by those who suffer themselves to be *commanded* by Him. The hearing of prayer is not affected by the conduct of man fixed by his relation to God, but by this relation which produces in man childlikeness, childlike obedience, childlike trust, childlike disposition and childlike ways, even as it affords paternal fidelity and paternal aid. With faith in the name of His Son Jesus Christ thou hast the love of God above all things, or the fulfilment of the commandments of the first table; and from faith in the paternal love of God revealed in Christ flows Christian brotherly love, or the fulfilment of the commandments of the second table.—*He is in us*, this is ever the first and most important thing; His commandments are before our obedience to them; and He is with and in them. But if we do not value His commandments we do not value ourselves, we become ruins and a desert. In desert ruins He does not dwell; we must be builded up, if not into temples, at least into tabernacles. He builds—even the tabernacle into the temple, and instead of cares of the soul in indigence of the Good and the Eternal Good, jubilant hymns of praise for the inheritance of the saints swell in majestic fulness and strength. — Without Christ, the Son of God, God is not thy Father but without the Spirit of the Father and the Son, thou hast neither God the Father nor the Saviour.

Luther:—Although our conscience make us afraid and represent to us God as angry, yet God is greater than our heart. Conscience is but a single drop, but the reconciled God an ocean of consolation.—When a man is rebuked and condemned by his conscience, he grows terrified; but against this darkness of the heart we may say, God knoweth all things. Conscience is always fearful and shuts the eyes; but God is deeper and higher than thy heart and searches its inmost state most thoroughly.

Starke:—We believers do not indulge in idle imaginings and suppositions, but have sure, firm, irrefragable grounds and testimonies, wrought by the Holy Ghost Himself that we are of the truth and born of God.—A man may have a great temptation and yet be a child of God.—Away with forged letters and testimonials! if the inward witness of the conscience contradicts and condemns. Conscience is more than a thousand witnesses. How false is the charge that Christianity causes melancholy and gloominess! Sorrow may indeed be found among Christians but without any fault of Christianity or of God, and moreover with them true knowledge is followed by their sorrow being turned into joy.—A heart rejoicing before God is a great treasure; O, the happiness of being permitted to appear before God in His majesty with joyfulness; therefore let us pray: Lord, give us a cheerful heart!—The spirit of joyfulness is also a spirit of prayer. Believers will receive what they ask of God in the *manner* which He has promised and at the *time* He thinks proper.—Nothing can be required of a Christian beyond faith and love: believers will not be taken captive by statutes, but they stand in liberty.—Be ashamed to say or order anything *without* the commandment of God, and again be ashamed to do anything *in opposition* to the commandment of God.—To *live* a good life requires us to *abide* good; it is not enough to have *come* into God, one must also *abide* in Him.—The believer is a great miracle, seeing that the infinite and immeasurable God wholly dwells and walks in him.

Heubner:—Is here perchance taught work-confidence? No! faith remains the ground of justification but we may hope that the genuineness and purity of our faith will follow love.—The Christian's prayer is never unheard; for God gives us that which is good although not always that to which we gave utterance, not that which we intended; the Christian ever desires the Good and the Good only, and the better we grow, the more do all our desires coincide with the will of God. Only those are able to ask who are in a state of grace; a serious, pious, honest mind is the condition of prayer; a braggart cannot pray.—The presence and continued operation of the Spirit in keeping us in the right discipline, warning, moving, strengthening and comforting us, is the sign that we belong to Christ, if He leaves us we are separated from Christ.

Adapted from Ziel (*Gesetz and Zeugniss*, 4):—How happy they who are of the truth! 1. They may pacify their heart before Him. 2. They have a joyful confidence toward God; 3. They are they that will receive from Him whatsoever they ask.—Compare here hymns like Paul Gerhard's: "*Ist Gott für mich, so trete* (If God is for me, etc.).

Sein Geist spricht meinem Geiste	His Spirit cheers my spirit
Manch süsses Trostwort zu;	With words of comfort sweet;
Wie Gott dem Hülfe leiste,	That they God's help inherit
Der bei Ihm suchet Ruh;	Who rest with Him do seek.
Und wie Er hab' erbauet,	And that He has upbuilded
Ein' edle neue Stadt	A city fair and new,
Da Aug' und Herze schauet,	Where eyes and heart forever
Was es geglaubet hat.	What they believed shall view.
Da ist mein Theil und Erbe	For there in glory lying
Mir prächtig zugericht't;	My lot is held in store
Wenn ich gleich fall und sterbe,	With all my falls, and dying,
Fällt doch mein Himmel nicht. (*v.* 9.)	My heaven falls nevermore.

Also ERDMANN NEUMEISTER'S: *Jesus nimmt die Sünder an* (Jesus, sinners does receive); especially v. 7.

Mein Gewissen quält mich nicht,	My conscience now is purified,
Moses darf mich nicht verklagen;	All plea to Moses is denied,
Der mich frei und ledig spricht,	He acquitteth me to-day
Hat die Sünden abgetragen (1 Jno. iii. 5),	Who all sin did take away;
Dass mich Nichts verdammen kann;	Nothing can condemn or grieve
Jesus nimmt die Sünder an.	Jesus sinners does receive.

[PYLE: vv. 19–21.—This will show us to be Christians indeed; and while the impartial testimony and inward sense of our own consciences assure us of the sincere performance of our own duty, we may safely conclude that God, the Searcher of hearts and Standard of all truth, will approve of and reward us. And on the contrary, whoever by the clear conviction of his own mind knows and feels himself to be a hypocritical transgressor of his moral duty, must be assured that God, who knows him better than he does himself, cannot fail to be his more severe judge and avenger.—M.].

[BULL: v. 20.—If a man be conscious to himself of his own wickedness, yea, the very secret wickedness and hypocrisy of his heart, sure God Himself, who set up in every man this "*candle*" of conscience, as Solomon calls it, Prov. xx. 27, cannot be ignorant of it; He being the fountain of all knowledge, and all knowledge in the creature derivative from Him, and so knowing all things that are knowable by any creature, and infinitely more.—M.].

[MACKNIGHT: v. 22.—This general declaration must be limited by the conditions, which in other passages of Scripture are made necessary to our petitions being granted by God; such as, that we ask things agreeable to His Will, ch. v. 14, 15; and that we ask them in faith, Jas. i. 6; that is, in the full persuasion of the Divine wisdom and goodness, and with sincerity and resignation. Such prayers, they who keep the commandments of God, may hope will be heard, because they keep His commandments by habitually doing the things which are well-pleasing to Him.—M.].

[PYLE: vv. 23, 24.—These verses may be thus paraphrased: In short, true faith in the doctrine of Christ, and true charity to mankind, especially to our Christian brethren, is the sum-total of our duty. And you, that have already duly performed it, have a sufficient pledge and earnest of your acceptance with God, as true disciples of Christ, by the gifts and graces of His Holy Spirit conferred upon you.—M.].

[RIDLEY: v. 24.—The way of the Spirit is not to be traced; the working of God is not to be perceived. The Divine Author and His operation are hidden from us, but His work is manifest. And though we cannot see God at any time, or feel the motion of the Spirit in our hearts, yet is there certain evidence whether we are brought on by Him or not. St. John gives us an infallible rule, that we may know that God, by His Spirit, dwelleth in us, if we keep His commandments.—M.].

[EZEKIEL HOPKINS:—*A clear conscience gives us boldness of access unto God.* Guilt abashes the soul, and makes it both ashamed and afraid to appear in the presence of God: and therefore Adam, as soon as he had sinned against his Maker, presently hides himself from Him. We may observe in ourselves, what a slavish dejectedness seizeth us when we come to God in duty, after we have wronged Him by any known sin: we come to Him suspiciously; and with such a misgiving fear, as if we would not have God take notice that we are before Him; and are still in pain, till the duty be over. But, when our consciences are clear, oh, with what delight do we haste to God, and with what content do we stay with Him! How doth the soul dilate and spread itself under the smiles of God, beating full upon it! "So, O Lord, here is a heart that I labour to make and keep void of offence; do thou fill it with thy promised grace and Spirit. It is not, indeed, a mansion pure enough for the pure and holy God; yet it is such, as thou wilt accept, and in which thou wilt dwell. There are still many hidden corruptions in it, but do thou search them out; and thou, who hast kept thy servant from presumptuous sins, do thou also cleanse me from secret faults." Thus a clear conscience, with a holy and reverend boldness, addresseth itself to God; and sweetly closeth up every duty and every prayer, with full assurance of obtaining mercy from God. So the Apostle (Heb. ix. 22): "Let us draw near . . . . in full assurance of faith:" how may we gain this full assurance, when we draw near to God? By "having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience:" get but a pure and clear conscience, and that will enable you to draw near to God in full assurance of faith, and so here (1 Jno. iii. 21): "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God:" if conscience be not evil to accuse us, then have we confidence towards God: when the face of man's conscience looks cheerful, and hath not a frown or a wrinkle upon it, this makes us joyfully to apprehend that God's face towards us is serene also, and that we shall be welcome at all times into our Father's presence: this conscience suggests to us, and makes us come with a holy, yet with an awful boldness unto God.—M.].

[BARROW:—No man can otherwise found any assurance of God's special love to him, than upon a good conscience: testifying that he doth sincerely love God, and endeavour faithfully to obey His commandments.—If we desire to judge reasonably about ourselves, or to know our true state, the only way is to compare our hearts and lives with the law of God, judging ourselves by that rule according to which God will judge us. If we find in our hearts the love of God and goodness (sincere although imperfect); if we perceive ourselves disposed to keep God's commandments (to live piously, righteously and soberly in this world); then may we have a satisfactory hope concerning our state; then "*we may* (as St. John saith) *have confidence toward God, because we keep His commandments and do those things that are pleas-*

ing to Him:" but if we do not find that mind in us, and that practice, we, in conceiting well of ourselves upon any other grounds, do but flatter and impose upon ourselves; if all the world should account us good, and take us to be in a good case, we should not at all believe them, or mind them; for *let no man deceive us, he that doeth righteousness, he* (and he alone) *is righteous*, is the most faithful advice and unquestionable sentence of St. John. It is therefore (that by resting on such false bottoms we be not abused, and drawn thence to neglect the amendment of our hearts and ways, in order to our final account) a duty incumbent upon us thus to search our hearts and try our ways, and accordingly to judge ourselves: the doing which with care and conscience would dispose us to prepare for the judgment we speak of; for, *If* (saith St. Paul) *we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged*, or not condemned. —M.].

[NEANDER:—(Christ), when about to part from His disciples, no more to be with them in His personal bodily presence, promised that He would be invisibly near and present among them, no less truly than during His earthly manifestation. The proof of this, His actual presence among them, should be the communication to them of His Spirit. This should be the medium between believers and their Saviour, until vision takes the place of faith; till that immediate view of Christ, enjoyed by His disciples in the familiar intercourse of his earthly life, is restored in heightened glory to believers. It is to this inward experience that the Apostle makes his appeal with these Churches and to it the inward experience of believers in all ages bears witness. Here, then, are conjoined two characteristic marks of fellowship with Christ which cannot be discovered from each other; the one inward, perceptible to the immediate inner consciousness, the other belonging to the outward life, but presupposing the former, of which it is at once the outward expression and the condition of its continuance. The first is–Participation in the Spirit —promised by Christ; the second, Obedience to His commandments, which is the fruit of that Spirit's agency, and in which such participation makes itself apparent. This being the Spirit's work, is also, as the evidence of this work, the condition of its continuance; all Divine gifts being conditioned upon the faithful use of what "is bestowed, according to the words of Christ: Whoso hath, to him shall be given."—M.].

[On vv. 19, 20, see *De corde condemnante*, Critici Sacri Thes. Nov. 2, 991.

v. 20. A *Sermon* by ROBERT SOUTH, D.D.
SERMON THEMES: *God greater than our heart.*
Conscience an earnest of the last judgment.
Use to be made of the misgivings of conscience.

vv. 20, 21. CHARLES SIMEON, *A good and evil conscience*, Works 20, p. 454.

v. 21. R. SOUTH, *The nature and measures of conscience*, 2 Sermons.

v. 23. ANDREW GRAY, *The mystery of faith opened up*, 6 Sermons.
ISAAC WILLIAMS, *The Gospel a feast of Love*, Serm. 2, 67.

v. 24. JOHN FLAVEL, *The Spirit's indwelling*, Works, 2, 328.
J. BASNAGE, *L'union de l'âme avec Jésus-Christ*, Serm. 2, 501. —M.].

6. *Warning and Exhortation with reference to the false teachers.*

CHAPTER IV. 1–6.

Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of[1] God: be-
2 cause many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye[2] the Spirit of
God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come[3] in the flesh is of God:
3 And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus[4] Christ is come in the flesh is not of[1]
God: and this is that *spirit* of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come;
4 and even now already is it in the world.[5] Ye are of[1] God, little children, and have
5 overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world. They
6 are of[1] the world: therefore speak they of[1] the world, and the world heareth them. We
are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of[1] God heareth not us.[6]
Hereby[7] know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.

Verse 1. [[1] ἐκ, German: "out of."—M.]
Verse 2. [2] γινώσκετε A. B. C. G. al. Cod. Sin. has in the text γινώσκομεν, but corrected γινώσκετε.
[3] ἐληλυθότα A. C. Sinait.—B. reads ἐληλυθέναι; Vulgate: *venisse* conforming to the usage of Latin. [German: "Every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh."—M.]
Verse 3. [4] Instead of the reading of A. B. τὸν Ἰησοῦν, G. K. and Sin. have Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, but G. has also the Article and Sin. reads κύριον instead of Χριστὸν. Both readings, the shorter τὸν Ἰησοῦν, and the longer agreeing with v. 2, are well authenticated, and either may pass for the original reading, it being equally probable that the longer reading was abbreviated into the shorter, and that the shorter was changed into the longer; the testimony for both renders the decision very difficult; but the shorter form seems to be the *lectio difficilior*.—By the side of the reading ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ

τὸν Ἰησοῦν, the Church Fathers have the variation ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν, among the Latins Tertullian (*negantes—et solventes*, adv. Marc. 5, 16), Augustine *qui solvit Jesum et negat in carne venisse*) also the two conjoined. It is repeatedly asserted, that the heretics suppressed λύειν (Socrates *h. l.* 7, 32; Fulbert and Hincmar: *Eraserunt*, in Tischendorf 1859 *editio major*). Bengel well observes: *humanam potius artem, quam apostolicam redolet* (λύει) *sapientiam*. It is a dogmatical *terminus technicus* to denote the Nestorianism which dissolves the union of the Godhead and the humanity in Jesus Christ.

[Socrates, *H. E.* VII. 32: γέγραπτο ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀντιγράφοις ὅτι πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν. Irenæus (III, 8, p. 511 ed. Stieren): *Igitur omnes extra dispositionem sunt, qui sub obtentu agnitionis alterum quidem Jesum intelligunt, alterum autem Christum, et alterum Unigenitum, et alterum Salvatorem . . . Sententia enim eorum homicidalis, Deos quidem plures confingens et Patres multos simulans. Comminuens autem et per multa* dividens *Filium Dei; quos et Dominus nobis cavere prædixit, et discipulus ejus Joannes in prædicta epistola fugere eos præcepit dicens: "Multi seductores exierunt in hunc mundum, qui non confitentur Jesum Christum in carne venisse. Hic est seductor et Antichristus. Videte eos, ne perdatis quod operati estis." Et rursus in Epistola ait: "Multi pseudo-prophetæ exierunt de seculo. In hoc cognoscite Spiritum Dei. Omnis spiritus qui confitetur Jesum Christum in carne venisse, ex Deo est. Et omnis Spiritus qui* solvit *Jesum, non est ex Deo, sed de antichristo est." Hæc autem similia sunt illi quod in Evangelio dictum est, quoniam "Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis."*—Origen on Matth. xxv. 14 (Vol. IV. 359–361 ed. Lommat.): *Secundum hanc divinitatis suæ naturam non peregrinatur, sed peregrinatur secundum dispensationem corporis quod suscepit . —Haec autem dicentes non* solvimus *suscepti corporis hominem, cum sit scriptum apud Joannem "Omnis spiritus qui* solvit *Jesum non est ex Deo:" sed unicuique substantiæ proprietatem servamus. Si enim omnis homo fidelis "qui conjungitur Domino unus spiritus est:" quanto magis homo ille quem secundum dispensationem carnis Christus suscepit non est* solvendus *ab eo, nec alter est dicendus ab eo? Et vide quomodo ait: "Sicut homo peregre futurus" quoniam non erat homo, sed sicut homo et quasi homo peregrinabitur, qui erat ubique secundum divinitatis naturam."* While thus Irenæus and Origen clearly had the reading ὃ λύει before them, Polycarp, on the other hand, seems to quote, though loosely, the received text (Ep. ad. Philipp. cap. 7): Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστι. καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστί. καὶ ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας καὶ λέγῃ μήτε ἀνάστασιν μήτε κρίσιν εἶναι, οὗτος πρωτότοκός ἐστι τοῦ Σατανᾶ. [Alford].—Huther: Very singular is the opinion of Semler that ὃ λύει originated *oculorum vitio;* the reading may probably be accounted for from the polemics against Gnosticism (Grotius, Lücke, de Wette, Huther), and this supposition is borne out by the scholion in Matthæi p. 225: προώδευσαν γὰρ αὐτοῦ (τοῦ ἀντιχριστοῦ) αἱ αἱρέσεις, ὧν χαρακτηριστικὸν τὸ διὰ ψευδοπροφητῶν καὶ πνευμάτων λύειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῷ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι.—M.].

[German: "*And every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God.*"—M.]

[[5] German: "*And this is the* [spirit] *of antichrist, of which ye have heard that it cometh, and now it is in the world already.*" So Alford.—M.].

Verse 6. [6] ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἀκούει ἡμῶν is wanting in A. G. (perhaps by mistake?)
[7] ἐκ τούτου B. G. K. Sinait; important on account of ch. iii. 24; ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος.
[German: "*From this.*"—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The difference of the spirits renders the trial necessary, v. 1.

Ver. 1. **Beloved**:—The Apostle begins with ἀγαπητοί as ch. iii. 21 [cf. v. 7. ch. iii. 2.—M], in the joyful consciousness of the common blessings of the Divine adoption, and earnestly solicitous of inciting and exhorting those to the exhibition of brotherly love who are loved of God.

Believe not every spirit.—Here, as in ch. ii. 18–28, the Apostle adverts to the false teachers. Those who are to believe on the name of the Son of God (ch. iii. 23) in the power of the Holy Ghost (ch. iii. 24) given to them and bearing witness to their spirit that they are the children of God (cf. Rom. viii. 16), must not believe every spirit. The reference is to a plurality, a multitude of spirits (πάντι πνεύματι), not to a Dual but to a Plural. Hence, we must understand the expression of *the spirits of men* to whom *the spirit* bears witness. Every human spirit has its peculiarity, its special gifts and views, its mode of expression, which the animating, moving Spirit does not change or render uniform. Many a spirit might secure our approbation, sympathy and attention, which is not influenced by the Spirit of God. Hence the warning, to which, because of its great importance, there is forthwith annexed the exhortation: —"*But try the spirits whether they are of God.*" [Huther: The idea πνεῦμα is closely connected with ψευδοπροφῆται. The true prophets spoke, as we read 1 Pet. i. 21, ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι; the source of the revelations whose utterers (πρόφημι) they are, is the πνεῦμα ἅγιον or the πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, whereby is described, not an affection of their mind, but the Divine Power, different from their own individuality, which animates and influences them (δύναμις ὑψίστου, the synonyme of πνεῦμα ἅγιον, Luke i. 35.). This πνεῦμα speaks by the prophet, entering into his πνεῦμα and communicating to him the truth to be revealed; and thus the πνεῦμα of the prophet becomes a πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. But since every prophet has his own πνεῦμα, there is, although the πνεῦμα ἅγιον is *One*, a plurality of prophetical spirits. The same relation takes place in an opposite direction, in the case of the pseudo-prophets. They also are under the influence of one spiritual being, to wit, under that of the πνεῦμα, that ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστι, the πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης; this spirit also is *one*, but since it penetrates with its lie the πνεύματα of the pseudo-prophets and makes them like itself, we may say of the πνεῦμα of each individual prophet that is not of God, that it is not a πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, but a πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης."—The rationalistic interpretation of Socinus ("*sensus hominis aliquo modo inspiratus*") and Episcopius ("*doctrina*"), and the figurative construction of the word πνεῦμα = λαλοῦντες ἐν πνεύματι of Lücke, de Wette and Calvin ("*pro eo qui spiritus dono se præditum esse jactat ad obeundum prophetiæ munus*"), are equally irrelevant.—M.].

But try the spirits whether they are of God.—John evidently speaks of a plurality of spirits (τὰ πνεύματα). Instead of a receiving surrender to and of agreeing with them, of the *assensus* (πιστεύειν) John requires a δοκιμάζειν, a cautious criticism before the κατέχειν (1 Thess. v. 21), and he requires it of all like Paul, Rom. xii. 2; Phil. i. 20; Eph. v. 10; I Cor. x. 15; xi. 13, although some may have a special gift in discern

ing the spirits (1 Cor. xii. 10: διακρίσεις πνευμάτων Calvin: "*alloquitur—singulos fideles*," as opposed to Lorinus: "*Non omnium est probare; unum oportet in ecclesia summum judicem quæstionum de fide moribusque; id est sine dubio Pontifex Maximus.*" [This may be conclusive reasoning to Romanists, but will be utterly repudiated by Protestants, as an arbitrary dictum repugnant to Holy Writ.—M.]. The falsity of this exposition is evident both from the object of this text which every man ought to know; εἰ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν, whether they are of, originate in or proceed from God: the confession of Jesus Christ come in the flesh (v. 2), and from the danger, urging such a test, to which every one is exposed and which necessitates the decision [the Apostle proceeds to specify the reason why this trial is necessary.—M.].

Because many false prophets are gone out into the world.—These ψευδοπροφῆται answer to the ἀντιχρίστοις (ch. ii. 18). Cf. Matth. vii. 15; xxiv. 11, 24 (where also ψευδόχριστοι are specified), 2 Pet. ii. 1 (where ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι are paralleled with the ψευδοπροφῆται of the Old Testament). The idea of predicting something future is not any more the prominent point here than it constitutes in general the leading characteristic of the prophet; he derives his name from πρόφημι, because he has, as it were, behind him the Spirit that inspires him, whose thoughts he speaks out and makes known. The true prophet must be clearly distinguished from the hidden πνεῦμα influencing him, the true prophet is ὑπὸ πνευμάτος ἁγίου φερόμενος (2 Pet. i. 21); this πνεῦμα δύναμις ὑψίστου (Luke i. 35). The point at which He unites with the prophet, is the prophet's πνεῦμα, which as an organ to be influenced, must be clearly distinguished from the πνεῦμα ἁγίου who operates through it; for the πνεῦμα ἁγίου is the Source and Principle of the revelation, enters into the prophet's πνεῦμα, moves and imparts to the prophet, animates and prompts him, and thus the prophet's πνεῦμα becomes a πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, yet so that thereby the characteristics of the prophet's spirit are neither obliterated nor annulled, neither as to his temperament, nor as to his mode of utterance, nor as to qualification for specific relations of the spiritual or material worlds. Hence there are as many πνεύματα as there are προφῆται, notwithstanding the unity of the efficient principle which influences them. But alongside this πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, there is a πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου (v. 3), τῆς πλάνης (v. 6), that makes the ψευδοπροφήτας and whose spirit must not be believed. The πνεῦμα and πνεύματα designate not absolutely ψευδοπροφῆται (Calvin, Lücke, de Wette and others), nor the *sensus hominis aliquo modo inspiratus* (Socinus), nor *doctrina* (Episcopius), nor the superhuman principle animating man (Greek Comment., Augustine, Luther, Spener, Bengel (*spiritui, quo doctor aliquis agitur*), Neander, Düsterdieck and others). Cf. Huther [whose note I have translated above, under "Believe not every spirit."—M.].—With ἐξεληλύθασιν εἰς τὸν κόσμον Düsterdieck appropriately compares γεγόνασιν ch. ii. 18. After ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ we ought to supply a reference to the sending forth, the missionary activity which in the case of the false prophets is an aping of the Apostles and the prophets; they come from, proceed, go out from him that makes them prophets. Cf. Jno. viii. 42; xiii. 3; xvi. 27, etc. cf. ch. xvii. 18; Matth. xiii. 49. It is therefore neither=*in publicum prodire*, as Matth. xiii. 3; xxvi. 55; Mark i. 35; viii. 11; Acts vii. 7 (Grotius, Calov, Lücke, al.), nor=*ex apostolis et eorum ecclesia*, as in ch. ii. 19 (S. Schmidt), nor=*ex sedibus suis* 2 Jno. 7. (Bengel).—On εἰς τὸν κόσμον cf. Jno. vi. 14; x. 36. They come into the world, which Christ was sent to redeem, which belongs to Him, in order to destroy it with their αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας. (2 Pet. ii. 1).

The standard of the trial. vv. 2, 3.

VER. 2. **In this know ye the Spirit of God.**—Ἐν τούτῳ here evidently points to the following sentence and γινώσκετε is not Indicative, but like πιστεύετε, δοκιμάζετε v. 1, the Imperative [on the other hand Alford, on account of the very frequent ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν, would let analogy prevail and take it as Indicative; but Huther, de Wette, Lücke and most commentators take it as Imperative.—M.].—That τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ denotes the Holy Spirit is evident both from the expression itself and from the antithesis τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου v. 3; the reference therefore is not to a *loquens de spiritualibus ex inspiratione divina* (Lyra). But the sequel shows that we have to think of the Divine Spirit working in the spirit of the prophets, to wit:

Every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is of God.—Ὁμολογεῖν is the oral confession of a doctrinal truth (cf. 2 Jno. 10.), like ch. ii. 23 (Düsterdieck, Huther and al.); confession with a walk agreeing with a Christian is not indicated here (Greek comm., Augustine, Bede), even though only a confession with the mouth emanating from the faith of the heart under the influence of the indwelling Spirit of God can be meant here, as in Rom. x. 9, 10; cf. ch. v. 11 sq.; ii. 22 sq.—The object of the confession: Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα. The form is that of a substantival objective-sentence; hence the participial form should be retained, and the rendering avoided which would make it an Infinitive thus: that Jesus Christ *is or has come* in the flesh; it is not a predicative sentence, but ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα is added attributively; that which is known is added in the Accusative. The names are taken in their literal sense at ch. ii. 22; here they stand, as in ch. i. 3, in juxtaposition and must not be separated according to ch. ii. 22, as if they imported: *Jesus the Christ* who is come in the flesh; so Luther renders wrongly in his Scholia, and Huther inclines in that direction. In like manner ἐν σαρκὶ must be held fast and not be made equivalent to εἰς σάρκα, as maintained by Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Piscator, Sander and al.; ἐν σαρκὶ denotes the mode of existence, in which He appeared and came; nor is there any ground here to assume here a pregnancy common among the Greeks who conjoin ἐν with verbs of motion in order to describe the result, the *rest* (cf. Winer, p. 449), to wit, that He had come *into* the flesh in order to remain and work *in* the flesh; so S. Schmidt and others.—Jesus Christ came *in the flesh* from the time of His birth after He σάρξ ἐγένετο and ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (Jno. i. 14) cf. ch. i. 1. sqq.—The *conversatio in carne, inter homines, in vera natura humana*, nor the *incarnatio*, which is

pre-supposed as the transition, is meant here; nor is here a limiting reference to *innumera mala* and *ipsa cruenta mors*, as maintained by Socinus, who erroneously refers to Heb. ii. 14; v. 7, and Grotius who adverts to a Hebraism.—Ἔρχεσθαι indeed is often used to designate the appearance of teachers, but then it either occurs with a qualifying ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, Matth. xxiv. 5, or ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, Jno. v. 43, or εἰς μαρτυρίαν, Jno. i. 7, or with an indication of the subject as ἐμπαῖκται, 2 Pet. iii. 3, or an addition like καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν οὐ φέρει, 2 Jno. 10, or as in Matth. xi. 18, of John, μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων or as in Matth. xvii. 11 of Elias καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα, so that the context invariably marks either the appearance of the teacher, or distinctly states that he is not exclusively referred to as a teacher, namely in his vocation of teacher. Here also the reference seems not to be exclusively to the office of a teacher or a prophet, which is by no means indicated by ἐν σαρκί. But it is important to notice here the tense; for while we have in this place the *part. perfecti* ἐληλυθότα, ch. v. 6 gives the *part. aor.* ὁ ἐλθὼν and 2 Jno. 7 the *part. præs.* ἐρχόμενον; the Present denotes the fact which is not a single act, in a moment, like birth, but has a longer duration which may be seen and represents this in a timeless form; the Aorist denotes an act as purely historical, the Perfect an act which, though historically completed, has present continuance (Winer, Part III. § 40). Thus this confession contains the fundamental truth of the Gospel; Χριστὸς and ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα indicate the dignity and existence of the Son of God and emphatically assert His humanity as a reality and a historical fact for all time. Bengel excellently remarks: "*In carne, est ergo Ipse aliquid præter carnem; hæreses veritatem carnis Jesu Christi negantes præsupponunt et eo ipso confirmant* DEITATEM *ejus, quippe cum qua non poterant conciliare carnem, tanquam ea dignam.*"

VER. 3. **And every spirit which confesses not Jesus, is not of God.**—Τὸν Ἰησοῦν comprehends what was said in v. 2, viz.; Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, it is just the historical Christ and none other.—Ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ=*if he does not* confess, while ὃ οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ would be=*who does not* confess. From this it is evident that John contemplates not so much distinct persons, as only distinct doctrines. Winer, part III. § 55. [Huther observes that μὴ denotes the *contradiction* of the true confession, while οὐ would express only a simple denial.—M.].

And this is the (spirit) **of antichrist, of which ye have heard that it cometh, and now it is in the world already.**—Τοῦτο refers to πνεῦμα, not to ὁμολογεῖν, and τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου is the (πνεῦμα) of antichrist; for τὸ pre-supposes a substantive or constitutes a substantival idea; were it, as Valla, Episcopius, Huther and al. render, *proprium antichristi*, matter of antichrist, τοῦτο would not refer to πνεῦμα but to ὁμολογεῖν; this would be rather an artificial construction and τὸ before τοῦ ἀντίχριστου would be superfluous. The passages adduced, viz. Matth. xxi. 21; 1 Cor. x. 24; 2 Pet. ii. 22; Jas. iv. 14, are somewhat different, for they import one and all a substantival idea, τὸ τῆς συκῆς, τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, τὸ τῆς αὔριον [that of the fig tree, that of himself, that of the proverb, the event of the morrow—M.], while here the Genitive alone would have been sufficient.—Ἀκηκόατε refers not to the written word ch. ii. 18 where we have already ἠκούσατε, but to the previous oral instruction they had received. The last clause καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν ἤδη, which emphatically asserts that the spirit of antichrist is already now, at the present time, working in the antichrists, is not governed by ἀκηκόατε but coördinated with καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου. Cf. ch. ii. 18.

Comfortable strengthening and assurance against the false prophets. vv. 4–6.

VER. 4. **Ye are of God, little children.**—The Apostle moved, and affectionately confident (τεκνία) that they all stand in the fundamental truth and are the children of God (ch. iii. 1, 2, 13, 14), urgently represents to them (ὑμεῖς emphatically placed first as in ch. ii. 24, 27), what is given to them: ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστέ, agreeing with the leading thought ch. ii. 29 and the context: the trial to be made is εἰ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν (v. 1) and he that confesseth Jesus is ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν (v. 3) and he that confesseth not Jesus ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν.

And have overcome them.—Αὐτοὺς are the ψευδοπροφήτας (v. 1), in whom the πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου is operative and connected with their πνεῦμα. Hence not: *antichristum et mundum* (Erasmus); the Vulgate renders falsely *eum*, which Lyra interprets: *mundum, devincendo concupiscentiam*, and other Roman Catholics: *antichristum* or *spiritum antichristi in antichristis*.—The Perfect νενικήσατε as at ch. ii. 13, 14, where τὸν πονηρὸν is the person overcome. The victory referred to there is inward in their hearts, here it is a victory not only in their hearts but also outward, visible in the life, in the sphere of their church-life, the Church; in the former place the victory is over Satan himself, here over his false prophets. But it is a victory actually achieved, and moreover a victory of continuous duration notwithstanding a succession of conflicts; through these very struggles and conflicts runs the victory already achieved and decisive, ye *have* overcome! ye have it! by your fidelity they with their seductive arts and temptations have been confounded (Ebrard). Cf. Jno. xvi. 33. Νενικήκατε is the Perfect not *propter futuritionis certitudinem* (Episcopius),=*potestis superare* (Rosenmüller). Calvin renders not very accurately: "*In media pugna jam extra periculum sunt, quia futuri sunt superiores.*" The ground of their victory and overcoming lies indeed in them, yet nevertheless above them.

Because He (that is) **in you is greater than he** (that is) **in the world.**—Ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν is He of (out of) whom they are, who abideth in them (ch. iii. 24; iv. 1, 2), that is ὁ θεὸς (Greek Comm., Calvin, Bengel, de Wette, Sander, Düsterdieck, Huther); this is also clear from the antithesis; it is understood of Christ by Augustine, Grotius, etc.—Ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ=ὁ διάβολος, whose children (τέκνα) the antichrists are, ch. iii. 10*a*—God is not only greater than our heart (ch. iii. 20), but also greater than Satan, than all things (Jno. x. 29; 2 Cor. ii. 14); all things belong to Him (1 Cor. xv. 57; iii. 23).—[Huther: "Instead of the more specific ἐν αὐτοῖς the Apostle uses ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ to intimate that the former, though having been for some time in the Church, belong to the κόσμος, which is expressly declared in the

words following. Socinus: "*Quamvis Johannes, non de eo, qui sit in falsis prophetis, sed de eo, qui sit in mundo, verba faciat, tamen necesse est, ut mundi appellatione falsos istos Prophetas comprehendat, vel potius plane intelligat, quod satis aperte declarant sequentia verba.*"—M.].

VER. 5. *The antithesis as to essence, work and success:*

They are of the world.—Ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, *quatenus Satanas est ejus princeps* (Calvin), hence not ἐξ ἡμῶν (ch. ii. 19). Cf. Jno. viii. 23, 44. The reference is not only to worldly lusts and carnal desires but to the ground and source of their life determining the exhibition of their life (διὰ τοῦτο).

Therefore they speak of the world and the world heareth them.—The substance of what they speak and their success with the world are conditioned by their being of [*out of, from*—as to origin—M.] the world. This λαλεῖν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου also is deep-reaching: *ex mundi vita ac sensu sermones suos promere* (Bengel). Huther capitally distinguishes λαλεῖν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου from ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖν (Jno. iii. 31) by the remark that ἡ γῆ is not an ethical notion like ὁ κόσμος. Although the separate points made by Oecumenius (κατὰ τὰς σαρκικὰς ἐπιθυμίας), the Scholiasts (ἐκ τῆς πονηρᾶς αὐτῶν γνώμης), Luther (*ea quæ mundus intelligit ac probat*), Grotius (*mundi affectibus congruentia*) and others, are correct, yet they shed light only on particular points and not on the whole. The approval and agreement of the world constitute a proof against them on the principle τῷ γὰρ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὅμοιον προστρέχει. Cf: Jno. viii. 37, 43, 47; xviii. 37. [The false prophets left the Church and went out into the world to which they stood in inward affinity, and proclaimed to it a wisdom that originated in it; therefore the world *heard* them, *i. e.* approved and assented to their word; τῷ γὰρ ὁμοίῳ κ. τ. λ. (Oecumenius); whereas the believers were hated and persecuted by the world, Huther.—M.].—Αὐτῶν ἀκούει denotes hearing attentively with inward delight, while ἀκούειν τινα signifies hearing in general without determining the sympathy of the hearer.

Inference and conclusion. v. 6.

VER. 6. **We are of God.**—A quickly added contrast of the false prospects without δέ. After what precedes there are here implied the two thoughts which are not expressed: διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ λαλοῦμεν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν ἀκούετε, although the latter is indicated by ὁ γινώσκων τὸν θεὸν ἀκούει ἡμῶν. Hence the Apostle understands by ἡμεῖς himself with the Apostles and the teachers in the Church (and not himself and the Church ὑμεῖς), as opposed to αὐτοί (v. 5) and the ψευδοπροφῆται (v. 1). This is the view of most commentators in opposition to Calvin, Spener, Lücke and al.

He that knoweth God, heareth us; he who is not of God doth not hear us.—The antithesis ὁ γινώσκων τὸν θεὸν and ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ requires, as is well known, that we should understand in the former clause ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι and supply in the second γινώσκειν τὸν θεὸν as the consequence. Hence ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι must not be taken here differently from vv. 1–4 and according to the contrast in v. 5. It is consequently not a general drawing and impulse towards God (as held by Lücke and Neander), but the state of grace of God's children, and their understanding of and conduct towards the word of God as preached to them. But nothing is said here concerning the manner how they did come into this state, nor is here any reference to predetermination (Hilgenfeld) or predestination (Calvin); we know also from ch. ii. 2, iv. 14; cf. Jno. iii. 16; i. 10 sqq. 29, that *all* are desired and may enter into the sonship. [Alford: Here we must remember carefully what the context is and what its purpose. The Apostle is giving a text to distinguish, not the children of God from those who are not children of God, but the spirit of truth from the spirit of error, as is clear from the words following. And this he does by saying that in the case of the teachers of the truth, they are heard and received by those who apprehend God, but refused by those who are not of God. It is evident then that these two terms here, ὁ γινώσκων τὸν θεόν, and ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ represent two patent matters of fact, two classes open and patent to all: one of them identical with the κόσμος above: the other consisting of those of whom it is said above, ἐγνώκατε τὸν πατέρα . . . . ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ch. ii. 13, 14. How these two classes are what they are, it is not the purpose of this passage to set forth, nor need we here inquire; we have elsewhere tests to distinguish them, ch. iii. 9, 10 . . . . ; we have a striking parallel, in fact the key to these words, in the saying of our Lord to Pilate, John xviii. 37.—M.].

From this we know the Spirit of truth and the spirit of error (deception).—Ἐκ τούτου refers to hearing, but since the matter in hand relates to the trial of the spirits that teach, the reference is to hearing the false prophets and to hearing the Apostles and the ministers of the Divine word [*i. e.* to the reception given to both classes.—M.]. Hence we must not think here of the criterion specified in vv. 2, 3, as maintained by the Roman Catholic Comm., Calvin, Hunnius, Calov and Neander.

In γινώσκομεν John includes the Apostles and the Church. On τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, cf. Jno. xiv. 17; xv. 26; xvi. 13; from which passages it is evident that the Genitive indicates that which the Spirit gives, testifies, whereto He helpeth and whither He guideth and leadeth; He is that Spirit that proceedeth from God and teacheth the truth to men. In like manner, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης is the spirit proceeding from the devil, deceiving and seducing men (ch. i. 8; ii. 26; 2 Jno. 8; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 11.) The latter is certainly in him whom the world hears, the former in Him to whom the children of God give ear.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Δοκιμάζειν is used here as by St. Paul, (see notes on v. 1, in Exegetical and Critical) and as the Lord Himself bids His Church do, Matth. vii. 15, 16. The Roman Catholic proposition: "*Ecclesia in suis prælatis est judex controversiarum*" is not true; they limit to the *ecclesia repræsentans* and to the [visible] head of that, what the Lord of the Church and his Apostles say to all believers. However it is important to remember that the Apostle restricts this right and duty of trial

simply to the question whether the teachers are of God, and that he does not mean questions affecting the learning, wisdom or eloquence of teachers, or questions of secondary importance and on controversial points; he only refers to that which is necessary to the salvation of our souls. On this head every Christian ought and may, if necessary, apply the test.

2. The believing Confession of One Jesus Christ uniting in Himself the Godhead and the Manhood, even the confession of the historical Christ is necessary to salvation and essentially Christian. John, of course, understands ὁμολογεῖν as engaging the powers of the whole Christian and not only the oral confession without the heart; for he adverts to the πνεύματα, specifies the antithesis μὴ ὁμολογεῖν and proceeds throughout in a contemplative manner. If this were not so, the true disciples of Jesus would have the same confession as the demons as their distinguishing mark (Luke iv. 41; Matth. viii. 29); hence the *contents* of the confession are not decisive *per se*. Cf. Harless, *Ethik* § 89** p. 174.—But Estius has no warranty for limiting St. John's direction to the apostolical age and for considering the confession of the Lord's Supper as the criterion now; on the former confession depends also the latter, for the doctrine of the Lord's Supper reflects of course the Christology, since the fellowship with Christ is accomplished in the most pregnant manner in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Nothing is truly Christian without the living Christ.

3. According to the Johannean mode of expression the contrast brought out here is to be conceived as an error wholly gnostic, spiritualizing and misinterpreting the historic and directed more against the corporealness, *i. e.* the manhood of Christ than against his Godhead, an error rather Docetical than Ebionite. For σάρξ does not denote merely the human body apart from the human ψυχή, the human νοῦς, the human will or self-consciousness, which could not be done by the preposition ἐν, but it signifies the human nature, the manhood; and this is conceived in the precise manner in which He appeared in the world. Cf. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* ii. 1. p. 76, sq.

4. John does not predicate of man independence, self-glory and perfect freedom in the sphere of his spiritual life; either the Spirit of God or the spirit of Satan determines the spirit of man and conditions his views, inclinations, knowledge, words and deeds. Behind the πνεῦμα of man stands the directing, determining, operating and fulfilling πνεῦμα, which through the former and united with it, works on the world and on men.

5. But any disposition of the human spirit for the Spirit of God or the spirit of Satan is no more taken for granted here than that the Spirit of God and the spirit of Satan are or might be supposed to be in a state of coördination. Rather, we should say, does this victory, of which the Apostle discourses in such lofty strains (v. 4, cf. ch. ii. 13, 14; v. 4, 5), assert the superiority of the Divine Spirit to Satan and denote both the monarchy of God and the enmity of Satan, at the same time intimating however, that, though men may suffer themselves to be controlled either by God or Satan, all men ought to be and might become God's.

6. The Apostle contemplates the reality and the possession of the Divine sonship (εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ=γεγεννῆσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ), which is evident from his specification of the marks whereby the existence of this relation may be determined; the reference, therefore, is not to the origin, the beginning of one's being of God, to the manner how it is attained. The same remark applies to Jno. xviii. 36, 37 and also to ch. viii. 43-47, as is manifest from v. 30: πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν and v. 31: ἐὰν μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ. The sonship or state of grace of faith in Jno. viii. is however quite young and only begun, while the case before Pilate and in the passage under notice respects the believing people in His Kingdom and under His Rule. According to the Johannean conception we have to view the sonship or state of grace of believers as complete from the beginning although ever progressing towards perfection and consummation and to the inheritance itself. A young babe or a suckling is surely a perfect man, a rational creature, though only as to the germ, and not yet a man, not yet fully developed in all the powers and gifts wherewith it is endowed.

[7. As supplemental to the exegetical notes on v. 3, and No. 3, above, it may be profitable to put together some of the interpretations of this difficult passage.

1. The *Socinian*.—Socinus: "*Jesum Christum*, i. e. *Jesum qui dicitur Christus, non modo mortalem hominem fuisse, sed etiam innumeris malis et denique ipsi cruentæ morti obnoxium.*" Grotius: "*Non cum regia pompa et exercitibus, sed in statu humili, abjecto, multisque malis ac postremum cruci obnoxio.*" But it has been shown that ἐν σαρκί cannot be construed in this sense.
2. Those *assertive* and not only implicative of our Lord's Incarnation. The commentators, most of them orthodox, who give this interpretation, either confound ἐν σαρκί with εἰς σάρκα (Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Piscator, Sander and al.), or waver between ἐν and εἰς, *e. g.* Hunnius: "*Tunc venire in carne dicitur Jesus Christus quando* λόγος *ex sua velut arcana sede prodiens assumta visibili carne se in terris manifestat.* Here we must also name the exposition of Augustine, who introduces in the train of the Incarnation the death and redeeming love of Christ, and makes the confession denial depend on "*caritatem habere*" (Alford); saying: "*Deus erat et in carne venit: Deus enim mori non poterat, caro mori poterat: ideo ergo venit in carne ut moreretur pro nobis. Quemadmodum autem mortuus est pro nobis? Majorem hac caritatem nemo habet, quam ut animam suam ponat pro amicis suis. Caritas ergo illum adduxit ad crucem. Quisquis ergo non habet caritatem, negat Christum in carne venisse.*"—To put the question in his own words: "Arius and Eunomius, and Macedonius and Nestorius own that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, are not they therefore of God?" and then replies that those hierarchs did *not* in fact *confess* Christ to have come in the flesh, because whatever they might do by *words*, they in their *works* denied Him (Tit. i. 16). "They have not *charity*," he

says "because they have not *unity*, and therefore all their other gifts are of no avail." (1 Cor. xiii. 1-3).—But the Apostle says here nothing of charity, or unity, or of the love of Christ, but he simply asserts the true Manhood of our Lord, and this brings us

8. To the true interpretation which takes ἐν in its proper meaning and applies the passage to the case of the *Docetæ* who maintained that our Lord had only an apparent and not a real body. See also the extracts from Irenæus and Origen above in *Appar. Crit.* note 4.—M.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The command: Try! 1. The occasion (v. 1: many false prophets); 2. The importance (v. 1: whether they are of God); 3. The difficulty (v. 1: the spirits); 4. The right (v. 4: ye are of God); 5. The standard (vv. 1, 3: the confession and the contradiction, cf. v. 6.).—Be not afraid of the majority of votes, but fear the majesty of the truth of (out of) God; take care that thou do not violate it; the former cannot and must not have any influence in matters of eternal truth and of eternal life. Not from the masses comes the truth, but from One, with whom you ought to vote and to whom you ought to assent; but though it comes only *from* One it is nevertheless designed *for* all and should be brought to and diffused among the masses by means of preaching, testimony and confession.—You ought to regard as a Christian and a brother whoever clings to Christ in faith, no matter how heretical the sect to which he may belong.—Communities and Christians grow more and more imperfect, the former into sects and the latter illiberal in proportion as they strive to give undue prominence to any one point of the truth except that of a believing and vital confession of Christ. You may not even push into the background the sphere of creation with its appointments before redemption and its glory, for Christ is also the Creator of the world.—The question is the pursuit of victory in order to secure and preserve unimpaired eternal peace for eternity.—The fundamental truth is simple and ever plain to the simplicity of the heart. That with which you are familiar you understand and love; what you cling to, cleaves to you; that in which you live, lives in you; that, for and of which you speak, speaks out of you.—Either a prophet of God or a false prophet, either of God or of the world, moved either by the Spirit of God or by the spirit of antichrist, by the Spirit of truth or the spirit of error; a middle way and a third course are not provided.—Neither you nor any of your acquaintance may be able clearly to perceive your point of gravity, but it is there, and One, now a Saviour, but hereafter the Judge, knows where and what it is and will make it manifest in preliminary judgments here, but in the final judgment there.

STARKE:—Trust, believe, whom? It concerns not riches and possessions, but your soul and salvation. It is amazing that most men are concerned about false wares, whereby they incur certain and eternal loss. The prudent will make inquiries and not join in with an inconsiderate credit.—Lying spirit, that sayest that the Christian religion is founded on credulity! Gross lies! it requires faith, but rejects credulity.—We ought to believe sincere, experienced and honest teachers, yet so that we look only and solely to God and rest in Him as the author of the wisdom which they proclaim. Teachers should willingly subject their teaching to the trial of others, even to the trial of their own hearers, and consequently not only not deter them from it but also to urge them to it, and direct them away from themselves to God and His Spirit; otherwise they will not make honest Christians but render themselves suspicious.—The government alone has not the power of appointing teachers at its option regardless of the views and wishes of the whole Church (or congregation), whose wishes should be duly consulted, for God has clothed it also with the power and ability to try the spirits. [Such a caution, however relevant on the Continent of Europe, is of course unnecessary in the U. S.—M.].—Whatever obscures and lessens in word or deed the person, office, doctrine and glory of Christ, is heretical.—Be of good courage! though the world and the devil rage, thou hast a strong support, for God, who is with, by and in thee, is greater than all.—Whenever we are victorious, we ought to ascribe the glory of our victory not to ourselves but to God; otherwise if we take the least credit to ourselves, we rouse a new enemy, spiritual pride, most dangerous in this that it enables Satan easily to overcome us.—Like seeks like; the world loves its own but hates those who have gone out from the world.

HEUBNER:—The Christian spirit of trial is intimately connected with faith. Faith is not credulity.—This trying is a duty which belongs to every age and especially in our age when so many teach against the Scripture and still set up the pretension that they have the Spirit, and consider themselves full of spirit and others spiritless. It is the duty of all Christians; consequently, also the duty of the laity.—The conditions of this trial are simplicity of heart, a firm faith, and prayer to the Lord for clearness of perception (to open our eyes). The deceived have indeed excuses to offer; but there would not be so many of the deceived, if they had a pure mind and would try. Try the more frequently and carefully, the more the spirit of deceivers flatters thee and thy vanity, and the greater the number of these spirits grow.—Everything which lays irreverent hands on the Person of Christ, from any side, is decidedly unchristian.—Should John have given us a false criterion? Maintaining this is already the sign of a bad cause. Whatever is anti-christian shows its true character by its contradicting the Apostles.—The superiority of the Spirit of Christ to the error-spirit of the world gives to the Christian the preponderance; he need not fear any assaults of unbelief. John foretells certain victory. All the shouts of victory on the part of unbelievers are nothing but false alarm. All antichristianity panders to the spirit of the world; it flatters, if not the loose morality, yet the vanity and conceit of the world which finds it burdensome and confounding to believe in the Crucified One.—The false apostles prove the dignity of the true Apostles.

BESSER:—Any pupil in a catechism-class, in order to be on his guard against the false prophets, may determine whether the teaching of a prophet has the grape-taste of Christ's vine or the aloe-taste of the thorn of the flesh and reason.—It is not because of the parts of the truth they hold in common with the Church, but because of the error wherewith they contradict the confession of the Church, because of the broken branch on the tree of truth, because of the cancer in the body of truth, that the sects are congregated as separate communities.

KRUMMACHER:—*The frontier of Christianity.* 1. *In which way is it decided?* Are the cumbersome trinity, God, virtue and immortality, or birth within the pale of Christendom, individual interpretation, the opinion of the majority of one's contemporaries—to determine Christianness? 2. *The final infallible decision*, over against the skeptics, those who are at variance with the confessions, those who only seek for the word of God in the Scriptures but do not receive the Scriptures as the word of God, is given by the fundamental fact of the *supernatural revelation* in Christ, the necessity of *regeneration*, the *personal preëxistence of Christ* or of the *Godhead*.

FRONMÜLLER:—*Of the trial of the Spirits.* 1. *Why it is necessary?* Many false spirits have gone out into the world, the spirit of antichrist is already now in the world—in the Church, in the school, in the family, in private life, in the great and in the small. 2. *Which is its end and aim?* Whether they are of God or not. 3. *Which is its rule?* The confession.

[BURKITT: v. 1.—*Believe not every spirit*, etc. That is, every teacher who pretends to be inspired, and every doctrine that lays claim to the authority of Divine revelation: "but try the spirits," that is, examine their doctrine by the rule of the word of God, and try from whom they come, whether from the Spirit of God or from Satan.—M.].

[BP. HALL: v. 2.—Every one who confesseth Jesus Christ to have been God from all eternity, and in the fulness of time to have taken our nature upon Him, and to be come in the flesh, to accomplish the perfect work of man's redemption, is of God and speaks from God. And so by the contraries v. 3.—M.].

[BARROW:—He was not only (as the Gnostics and some other heretics have conceited) in shape and outward appearance (as a spectre, deluding men's sight and fancy), but in most real truth, a very perfect man; having a real body, figured and circumscribed like ours, compacted of flesh and blood, visible and tangible; which was nourished and did grow, which needed and received sustenance, which was tender and sensible, frail and passible, which was bruised with stripes, torn with scourges, pricked with thorns, pierced with nails, transfixed with a spear; which was mortal and underwent death by expiring its breath, and being disjoined from the soul that enlivened it. He had also a soul, endued with the same faculties as ours; with an understanding, capable of learning and improvement (for He was a man, ignorant of some things which He might know: and *He grew in wisdom and in stature*), with a will, subject and submissive to the Divine Will (see Mark xiii. 32; Luke ii. 52; Matth. xxvi. 39; Luke xxii. 42; Jno. v. 30; Matth. xxi. 18; Jno. iv. 6, 7), with several appetites, of meat, of drink, of sleep and rest (for we read that He was hungry, that He thirsted, that He was weary), yea with various passions and affections (φυσικὰ καὶ ἀδιάβλητα πάθη, I mean, that is, natural and irreprehensible passions), and these of the most troublesome and afflictive sort, such as zeal, pity and sorrow; the which were sometimes declared by very pathetical significations and are expressed in high terms; as upon occasion of His friend Lazarus's death it is said, *He groaned in Spirit and was troubled;* He then and upon other occasions, out of pity and sorrow, did *weep;* and ye know what excesses of sorrow, what anxieties and agonies, what tribulations, disturbances and amazements, the Evangelists, using those very terms, describe Him to have undergone at His passion; so that, as the Apostle to the Hebrews speaketh, "*We have not an highpriest that could not compassionate* (or sympathize with) *our infirmities, but who was in all points tempted* (or exercised and proved) *as we are, yet without sin.*"—M.].

[NEANDER:—Here is no other test of true faith, no other law for Christian union, than steadfast adherence to that one fundamental fact of the appearing of the Divine-human Redeemer. In all which proceeds from this belief, the influences of the Divine Spirit should be acknowledged. Hence it follows, that provided faith in this one fundamental fact be the soul of the Christian life, no minor difference of creed should be allowed to disturb Christian unity; that mistakes and alloys of Christian truth, which trench not on this one fundamental fact, should not hinder us from recognizing the Divine Stamp in him whose faith and profession have their root therein,—that the bonds of Christian fellowship should not thereby be sundered or loosened. Steadfast adherence to this one foundation is the mark of being from God, of the Spirit derived from God.—

Truth and error have each their peculiar history of development. As in the continued development of Christian truth, the Holy Spirit is ever revealing Himself in the inward consciousness of believers, that Anointing spoken of by St. John; so does error, proceeding side by side with this revelation, mingle therewith its own disturbing and adulterating influence,—rending single truths from their connection with the whole system of truth and giving them the stamp of error. These are the two currents, proceeding from the ever operative Spirit of Christ and from the spirit of the world; the latter mingling with the revelations of the former its own disturbing element and imitating them with a deceptive outward seeming.—M.].

[*Sermons and Sermon-themes.*

v. 1. AUGUSTINE, *Believe not every Spirit.* Libr. of Fathers, 20. 954.

TILLOTSON, ABP. *Of the trial of the Spirits.* Sermons 2, 29.

WATERLAND, DANIEL, *The springs and motives of false pretences to the Holy Spirit; with the rules and marks of trying and detecting them.* Sermons. Works 9, 336.

EDWARDS, JONATHAN, *The distinguishing marks of a work of the Spirit of God, applied to that uncommon operation that has lately appeared in New England.* 120. 1742. Works. 2, 254.

ZOLLIKOFFER, C. J. *Fanaticism in general.*
Fanaticism with regard to religious conceptions in particular. Sermons on prevalent errors and vices I. 95. 111.

SMITH, JOHN PYE, *On the means of obtaining satisfaction with regard to the truth of religious sentiments.* A Sermon, London, 1822.

v. 2. AUGUSTINE, *Every Spirit that confesseth not*, etc. Libr. of the Fathers 20, 960.
De probatione Spiritum. Cr. Sac. Thes. Nov. 2. 999.

vv. 2, 3. WILBERFORCE, R. I., *The sacramental system.* Serm. on the New Birth, 222.
VAUGHAN, I. C., *John's test of truth.* Sermons (1851), 121.

v. 4. SAURIN, I., *The superior evidence and influence of Christianity.* Sermons; 2, 323. In French, 7, 129.
Extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost.

vv. 4, 5. TILLOTSON, ABP., *The advantages of truth in opposition to error.* 2 Sermons. Serm. XI. 389.—M.].

---

7. *Brotherly love and Divine love as related to each other on the ground of Christ's advent.*

CHAPTER IV. 7–21.

7 Beloved, let us love one another: for[1] love is of God; and every one that loveth[2] is
8 born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth[3] not God;[4a] for God is
9 love. In this was manifested the love of God toward[4b] us, because[5] that God sent his
10 only begotten Son[6] into the world, that we might live through him. Herein[7] is[8] love,
not that we loved God, but that he[9] loved us, and sent[10] his Son *to be* the propitiation
11 for our sins.[11] Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another.
12 No man hath seen God at any time.[12] If we love one another, God dwelleth[13] in us,
13 and his love is perfected in us.[14] Hereby[15] know we that we dwell[16] in him, and he in
14 us, because[16] he hath given us of his Spirit. And we have seen and do testify that
15 the Father sent the Son *to be* the Saviour of the world.[17] Whosoever[18] shall confess[19]
16 that Jesus[20] is the Son of God, God dwelleth[13] in him, and he in God. And we have
known and believed the love that God hath to[21] us. God is love; and he that dwell-
17 eth[13] in love dwelleth[13] in God, and God in him.[22] Herein[23] is our love[24] made per-
fect,[25] that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so[26] are we
18 in this world. There is no fear in love;[27] but perfect love casteth out fear: because
19 fear hath torment.[28] He that feareth is not made perfect in love.[29] We love him,[30]
20 because he first loved us. If a man say,[31] I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a
liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how[32] can he love God
21 whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, That he who
loveth God love his brother also.[33]

Verse 7. [[1] German: "The love."—M.]
[2] πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν without τὸν θεὸν, B. C. Sin. al.—A. adds τὸν θεὸν.

Verse 8. [[3] German: "Knew not God;" Alford: "hath never known God;" Lücke "hath never learned to know Him at all." The force of the Aorist that he hath not once known God should be brought out.—M.]
[4a] ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν θεὸν is wanting in Cod. Sin., but adds ἐγνωκεν instead of γινώσκει (from v. 7). A.

Verse 9. [[4b] ἐν ἡμῖν—German: "*in* us" (*an uns*) "in regard to us." Alford.—M.]
[[5] ὅτι, not "because" but "that;" so German, Alford, Lillie.—M.]
[[6] German: "His Son, the only begotten."—M.]

Verse 10. [[7] ἐν τούτῳ; render "In this" as in v. 9. instead of the unnecessary variation "herein" of E. V.—M.]
[[8] German: "exists" Wordsworth "consists."—M.]
[9] αὐτὸς, the most authentic reading; A has ἐκεῖνος.
[10] Instead of ἀπεστείλεν, Cod. Sin. reads ἀπέσταλκεν as in vv. 9, 14.
[[11] German: "And sent His Son as propitiation for our sins." More correctly: "And sent His Son a propitiation for our sins." No need for the supplement *to be* in E. V.—M.]

Verse 12 [[12] German: "God hath no one ever seen." Alford: "God hath no one ever beheld." But render more idiomatically: "No one has ever beheld God."—M.]
[[13] μένει, μένομεν, etc., had better be rendered uniformly "abide."—M.]

[14] There is a great variation in the readings of the final words: ἐν ἡμῖν before τετελειωμένη ἐστίν A. Vulg; ἐν ἡμῖν after τετελειωμένη ἐστίν G. K. and many versions; ἐν ἡμῖν between τετελ. and ἐστίν Cod. Sin. B. [Alford: The love of Him is perfected in us.—M.]

Verse 13. [[15] ἐν τούτῳ—"In this." See note 7 above.—M.]
[[16] German: "that."—M.]

Verse 14. [[17] German: "*As* Saviour of the world." So Alford, Lillie. No need for the supplement *to be* in E. V.—M.]

Verse 15. [18] Instead of ὃς ἂν, B. reads ἐὰν.
[[19] German: "confesseth;" so Alford who justly objects to all Futures "shall confess," and *Futuri exacti* "shall have confessed" and recommends the English Present with an exegesis,—viz., "that this Present betokens not a repeated act and habit, but a great act once for all introducing the man into a state of ὁμολογῆσαι."—M.]
[20] B. adds Χριστός after Ἰησοῦς.

Verse 16. [[21] ἐν ἡμῖν. German: "*an uns*" literally "*at* or *on* us" to which "concerning us" or "in regard to us" come nearest.—M.]
[22] B. G. K. Cod. Sin. add μένει, which owing to the same conclusion of the preceding verse was more likely to be omitted than added.

Verse 17. [[23] "In this." See note 7 above.—M.]
[24] Cod. Sin. adds ἐν ἡμῖν after μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν, probably an error (with reference to v. 12) as ἐν ἀγάπῃ τῆς κρίσεως is plainly a slip of the pen.
[[25] German: "In this love with us is perfected;" Alford: "In this is love perfected with us." The rendering "our" of E. V. is almost solitary and should be changed. See below in *Exeget. and Critical.*—M.]
[[26] German: "Because as He is, we also are in this world." So Alford and Lillie, who transpose, however: "Are we also, etc."—M.]

Verse 18. [[27] German: "Fear is not in love." Alford: "Fear existeth not, etc."—M.]
[[28] German: "Punishment;" so Lillie, see note in *Exeget. and Critical.*—M.]
[[29] German: "Is not perfected in love." Alford: "Hath not been perfected in [His] love."—M.]

Verse 19. [30] Cod. Sin. reads τὸν θεὸν after ἀγαπῶμεν; G. K. αὐτὸν [A. B. omit either.—M.] A inserts οὖν after ἡμεῖς.
[German: "We love God."—M.]

Verse 20. [[31] German: "If one says . . . hateth . . ." Translate: "If any say . . . hate . . ."—M.
[32] πῶς, A. [K. L. al. Tischend. Alford—M.]; οὐ, B. Cod. Sin. [Lach. Buttm. al.—M.] The true reading cannot be determined by the analogy with ch. iii. 17 (Düsterdieck), or by the consideration that the interrogative is more expressive than the negative (Huther).
[German: "How can he love God (or: cannot love God) whom he hath not seen?"—M.]

Verse 21. [[33] German: "Also love his brother." Doddridge—"Love also his brother" Alford, Lillie.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection. The whole section vv. 7–21 insists upon the exhibition of brotherly love, because love is the very Essence of God (vv. 8, 16), as is evident from the sending and revelation of His Son (vv. 8, 10, 11, 14, 15), from our past and present experience of the love of God (vv. 10, 11, 16), from the experience of our confidence towards Him without fear (vv. 17, 18), and because as the children of God, we ought in grateful obedience, prove our enjoyment of such love by the love of our brethren, His children (vv. 19–21). Based on the γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 7), this exhortation belongs under the great leading thought ch. ii. 29, and connects with the warning against the false teachers, because faith in Jesus, in whom the love of the Father has been manifested and brought near to us, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit (v. 18), the Spirit of truth and the Witness of God's love in us, must evidence and manifest their truth and vitality in brotherly love.

Exhortation to brotherly love founded on the Being of God. vv. 7, 8.

VER. 7. **Beloved, let us love one another.**—Ἀγαπητοί, ἀγαπῶμεν, a very emphatic expression; being loved we must love; being in the enjoyment of love we are and dare not be without love; the exhortation, as ἀλλήλους shows, must be restricted to brotherly [Christian—M.] love and not be extended to general love of man. [But the ground, on which this exortation is based, viz. that God is Love (v. 8) and that He sent His Son εἰς τὸν κόσμον (v. 9), shows that the love of man in general is not excluded here. Cf. ch. iii. 13; so Ebrard.—M.].

Because the love is of God, and every one, that loveth, is born of God and knoweth God.—Ὅτι indicates the ground on which the preceding exhortation is made to rest. The demonstration is conducted on a general axiom of truth: *Omnis amor ex Deo est* (Bengel), *originem habet a Deo* (Calov). This thought especially strengthened by ἐκ, must not be weakened into: *caritas res divina maxime laudabilis* (Socinus, Episcopius), *Deo maxime placet* (Grotius), love is Divine as to its nature (de Wette), *Deus caritatis auctor est, quatenus nobis mutuæ caritatis causas abunde suppeditat* (Schlichting). Neither must we add with A. τὸν θεὸν, nor supply "the brother" with S. Schmidt, Lücke and al.—[Didymus singularly understood ἀγαπή here of Christ,—ἥτινα οὐκ ἄλλην εἶναι νομιστέον ἢ τὸν μονογενῆ, ὥσπερ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, οὕτω καὶ ἀγάπην ἐξ ἀγάπης ὄντα:—and Augustine fitting together "*Dilectio est ex Deo,*" and "*Dilectio est Deus*" infers that "*Dilectio est Deus ex Deo,*" which comparing with Rom. v. 5, he infers that love is the Holy Spirit (Tract. vii. 6). Alford—M.].—Now since love and life are and spring from God, a man that is born of God proves that he is born of God by loving; for he must have part of that which is in God and comes from Him. The Perfect also alongside the Present shows that here again *being born of God* is regarded as the antecedent fact, as the cause of love, and love as a consequence warrants and necessitates the back-inference of the truth and reality of being born of God. Cf. ch. ii. 29. Every one that is born of God knows also in his belonging to God, in his fellowship with God, God as the Source of love, and love as the Essence of God, and hence he must insist upon love and practise love, so that thereby he may prove his knowledge of and familiarity with God; to love and to know God are correlates, because love is of God. Hence Grotius (*ostendit se Deum nosse sicut oportet*) errs less than Calvin (*vera Dei cognitio amorem Dei necessario in nobis generat*).

VER. 8. **He that loveth not hath never known God.**—Consequently: he that lacks love in general, has not known God, has never learnt to know Him at all (Lücke), has never made even the beginning of the knowledge of God (Düsterdieck); this rendering is required by the

Aorist ἔγνω joined to ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν. The reason of this is given in the following:

Because God is love.—A proposition which in the negative formula, according to the well-known manner of the Apostle, still further defines the former assertion that "love is of God." This relation of the two propositions and of their contents requires us to give to ὅτι a causal construction; hence it indicates the reason and not the contents of ἔγνω (Tirinus: *non novit, Deum esse caritatem*); in that case ὁ θεὸς also ought to be wanting and it would be: οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἀγάπη ἐστίν. Cf. Acts xiv. 18. Winer, p. 469. Ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν=*Deus nihil* est *quam mera caritas* (Luther), *Dei natura nihil aliud est, quam caritas, quam bonitas, quam summum bonum, sui ipsius communicativum* (Hunnius). The Being of God is Love; therefore love springs from God. The word is to be taken *essentialiter* with most Catholic [Anglican—M.] and Lutheran Commentators, and not ἐνεργητικῶς with Calvin and Beza: *Dei natura est homines diligere;* for this construction makes God's Love-*Essence* give place to God's *manifestation* of love and adds the limitation of its application to men, whereas angels and even the Trinitarian God are objects of the love of God. Still farther removed from the depth of this saying, even to shallowness, are the expositions of Socinus (*caritas est Dei ipsiusque voluntas effectus et is quidem maxime proprius*), Grotius (*Deus est plenus caritate*), Rosenmüller (*benignissimus*). In this, that God is love as to His essential Being, lies the reason, why he that is born of God, must also have love and live in love and why the love of God must be allied with the love of the brethren who are also born of God. [Equally shallow are the explanations of Benson: "God is the most benevolent of all beings; full of love to all His creatures," Whitby: "The Apostle intends not to express what God is in His Essence . . but what He is *demonstrative*, ἐνεργητικῶς, showing great philanthropy to men," and Hammond "God is made up of love and kindness to mankind."—Alford reviewing these quotations says that in them the whole force of the axiom as it stands in the Apostle's argument is lost; "unless he is speaking of the Essential Being of God, *quorsum pertineat*, to say that he that loveth not never knew God, because "God is love?" Put for these last words, "God is loving," and we get at once a fallacy of an undistributed middle: He that loveth not never knew what love is: God is loving: but what would follow? that in as far as God is loving, he never knew Him: but he may have known Him as far as He is just or powerful. But take ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν of God's essential Being,—as a strict definition of God, and the argumentation will be strict: He that loveth not never knew love: God is love [the terms are co-essential and co-extensive]: therefore he who loveth not never knew God."—M.].

Revelation of the love of God through Christ. vv. 9, 10.

VER. 9. **In this was manifested the love of God in** (*on*) **us.**—"We hear the lovely, the living echo of Christ, Jno. iii. 16." (Heubner). Ἐν τούτῳ points to the sequel. Ἐφανερώθη as contrasted with the hidden Being of the invisible God, annexes the objective, actual appearing and manifestation of the ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, of the love which is God's, in God, as in ch. i. 2; iii. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 16; there is no reference whatever to subjective knowledge. [Huther: "The Apostle does not want to say that the love of God has been *known* by us through the sending of His Son; cf. v. 16, but that therein it stepped forth from its concealment, and did in reality manifest itself."—M.].—Ἐν ἡμῖν defines either the sphere in which, or the object *at* which [with regard to which—M.] the manifestation took place; it should be connected with the verb and rendered, either *among* us, *with* us, or *at* [in, with regard to] us. But the context does not introduce us merely as spectators but as receivers of the Divine love (ἵνα ζήσωμεν); and this love is not only to us an object of contemplation, which would be expressed by the Dative ἡμῖν without the preposition; but we ourselves are objects of this love, every one of us believers has experienced it; hence we ought not to leave the matter undecided (Lücke), but must decide for the rendering *at* [in, with regard to—M.] us (Düsterdieck), according to the manifest analogy of Jno. ix. 3, where ἐν must be thus construed and explained; hence we may not connect it with ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ (Huther and al.); for it was not the love of God in believers which was manifested, as if the believers existed before the manifestation of God's love in Christ, but the love of God appeared in Christ and was manifested not *to*, but *at* [in] the believers. On this account Bengel's explanation: "*Amor Dei, qui nunc in nobis est,*" is equally untenable. Still less admissible is it to make ἐν ἡμῖν=εἰς ἡμᾶς, as is done by Luther, Spener and al. Cf. Winer, pp. 231, 436.—Ἐφανερώθη is explained by what follows:

That God hath sent His son, the only-begotten, into the world.

This is the fact of the manifestation. The designation τὸν μονογενῆ the *only* child (Luke vii. 12; viii. 42; ix. 38; Heb. xi. 17; Jno. i. 14, 18; iii. 18), *ad auxesin valet* (Calvin); what love, that He sent His only son (Huther)! It is therefore not=ἀγαπητός, *omnium creaturarum longe carissimus, sibi dilectissimus* (S. G. Lange, Socinus, Grotius). John thus marks the exaltation of the Son, just as the term ἀπέσταλκεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον denotes His pre-existence (Jno. iii. 17; x. 36): to be sent, to be sent into the world can only be true of one already born, not of one who is only born in the world, but one existing above and before the world, 1 Jno. i. 1.

That we might live through Him.—Thus ἐν ἡμῖν is explained. This indication of the purpose, ἵνα, points as much to the life-fulness in Christ as to our poverty. Cf. ch. iii. 16, 17. [Baumgarten-Crusius: Μονογενής and ζήσομεν are the two emphatic words: The most exalted One—for our salvation!—M.].

VER. 10. **In this exists love.**—[German like Greek "*the* love," *i. e.* love in the abstract.—M.]. Ἀγάπη is to be taken quite general, as at ch. iii. 16 (Neander, Düsterdieck, Huther), without the supplement of τοῦ θεοῦ (Spener, Lücke, Sander, de Wette, Brückner and al.), as at Rom. v. 5.

Not that we loved God, but that He loved us.—The simplest construction is to supply ἐν τούτῳ to οὐχ and ἀλλά. Thus preparation is made for the comprehensive term πρῶτος v. 19; the initiation of loving is with God; the beginning

and origin of love is in God (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ); ἡμεῖς and αὐτὸς are here emphatically contrasted like τὸν θεόν; *amari dignissimum*, and ἡμᾶς, *indignissimos* (Bengel), the self-existence, independence, of the Divine love are intimated by the prevenience of that love absolutely unconditioned by any merit on the part of men; the former is what is really said here (Huther), the other, as we may justly infer from what follows, (ἱλασμὸν) and from what precedes (ἵνα ζήσωμεν), is implied (Düsterdieck). Hence there is no reason whatsoever for rendering ὅτι once "*because*" and then "*that*" (Baumgarten-Crusius), or for translating both times "*because*" but only as protases, thus: not because we loved Him but because He loved us, did He send His Son (Lachmann), or for a transposition of the words as if we did read: ὅτι οὐκ (Grotius), or for taking the first proposition as a dependent clause=ἡμῶν μὴ ἀγαπησάντων (Meyer: that although we have not loved God before, yet did He love us). a Lapide erroneously assigns to the implication the first place saying: "*Hic caritatem Dei ponderat et exaggerat ex eo, quod Deus nulla dilectione, nullo obsequio nostro provocatus, imo multis injuriis et sceleribus nostris offensus, prior dilexit nos.*"

And sent His Son (as) a propitiation for our sins.—This is the proof in fact of αὐτὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς. The Aorist ἀπέστειλεν, like ἠγαπήσαμεν, ἠγάπησεν, simply narrates, while the Perfect ἀπέσταλκεν v. 9 absolutely presentiates Christ's having been sent (Lücke). Ἀπέστειλε stands emphatically in ante-position in order to set the act of God in relief; ἱλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν has an explanatory and substantiating reference to ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ v. 9. Cf. ch. ii. 2; iii. 16. Insufficient: *testatum fecit, se velle condonare* (Rosenmüller).

Brotherly love inferred. v. 11. [from vv. 9, 10, *and substantiating the exhortation* v. 7.—M.]

VER. 11. **Beloved**—ἀγαπητοί has a peculiar emphasis and distinct meaning, *i. e.* it designates those who stand in the enjoyment of the experience of the love of God.

If God so loved us.—Because εἰ with the Indicative introduces the aforesaid fact, it is described as an indubitable ground for an inference to be built upon it. [Alford calls attention to the difficulty of rendering this εἰ with an Indicative in English, which is neither any expression of uncertainty, nor=*since*, or *seeing that;* he describes it as "a certainty put in the shape of a doubt, that the hearer's mind may grasp the certainty for itself, not take it from the speaker." If (it be true that) . .—is perhaps the nearest filling up of the sense."—M.]. Οὕτως denotes the preceding description of love; it is here=*hac ratione*, prevenient without any merit on our part, in the sending of His Son for the propitiation of our sins; but it is not=*tanta caritate*, as in Jno. iii. 16 (where οὕτως—ὥστε requires such a construction, as Düsterdieck rightly observes). There is no warrant for the interpretation: *nullo hominum discrimine* (Grotius).

We also ought to love one another.—In the first place we have to take notice of ἡμεῖς—ἀλλήλους: *we*, first the object of the glorious love of God (ἡμᾶς) must now also regard and treat every Christian as an object of Divine love and consequently become the subjects of such experienced Divine love; to this necessitates us the brother whom God loves, and to this compels us the love with which we ourselves are loved. Hence the Apostle uses the word ὀφείλομεν not only because there is extant for it an objectively given commandment and example, but also a subjective preparation for it; as God's children, born out of Him who is Love, born out of His Love-Being, we must love one another.

There is no fellowship with God without brotherly love. vv. 12, 13.

VER. 12. **No one hath ever beheld God.**—Cf. Jno. i. 18: ἑώρακεν. The Perfects there, like τεθέαται here are on account of πώποτε to be emphatically referred to the past with respect to its separate course and periods, and must not be construed according to a Hebraism, as carrying present force (Estius), or as comprehending the past and the present (Lücke). The word τεθέαται denotes calm, continued looking at and contemplation of a thing, but it is real seeing [in the literal sense of the word as distinguished from spiritual beholding, inward vision—M.]; this is the view of the Greek Commentators, (Augustine, Spener, Lücke and al.), as in v. 14 and=ἑώρακεν also v. 20. The sense is: God is invisible (1 Tim. vi. 16). Passages like Exod. xxxiii. 20, and Gen. xii. 7; xvii. 1 etc., are not contradictory, since where God did appear, it was not His face, but some assumed form that became visible. Consequently the passage must not be interpreted in a spiritual sense, as if it imported spiritual seeing and that God cannot be known and apprehended by man's own, natural powers (Piscator), or immediately (Rickli), or as He is (Estius), that He is consequently inscrutable (Neander). The explanation of this axiom follows from,

If we love one another, God abideth in us and His love is perfected in us.—The proposition: θεὸν οὐδεὶς πώποτε τεθέαται, obviously refers not to the proposition ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους which contains a presupposition and a condition, but to the leading thought: ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν μένει. The Apostle is wholly concerned with the inward life-fellowship, with the inward relation between God and man which is to be carried on to perfection and which manifests itself in brotherly love; hence brotherly love is only the presupposition and condition of the assertion and assumption of such life-fellowship with God, but not of that relation itself (contrary to Frommann). So especially Düsterdieck, Huther. The invisibility of God surely does not exclude our love to God (v. 20. cf. 1 Pet. i. 8); nor is the invisibility of God used here to direct us to brotherly love, as if we should show to the brethren what we cannot show to Him (Lücke and al.); in that case θεὸν οὐκ θεᾶσθαι and not ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους would have been introduced with ἐάν. Ἀγάπη θεοῦ denotes His love, the love of God, even the love peculiar to and inhering in Him, which is in us, if He ἐν ἡμῖν μένει. In this life-fellowship with Him we participate in His love, which is τετελειωμένη, has become perfected [*i. e.* has reached its full completion and maturity.—M.]. This love has its history of growth and completion in us and corresponds *pari passu* with brotherly love: where the one is, there is also the other; they mutually conditionate each other; it is loving with God, (out) of God, in God, which with Him is in us as His Being; de-

tiful loving (ὀφείλομεν v. 11) is *natural* in believers. Hence the reference is not to God's love to us (Hunnius, Calov, Spener, Beza, Sander and al.), for the predicate would not suit such a construction; nor to our love to God (Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Lücke, Neander, Düsterdieck and others), nor to *ea dilectio quam Deus præscripsit* (Socinus), nor to the mutual relation of love between God and us (Ebrard).

VER. 13. **In this we know that we abide in Him and He in us, that He hath given us of His Spirit.**—The mark of recognition of the life-fellowship of God with us, and among ourselves with God, agrees exactly with the description at ch. iii. 24, as does also the reference to the gift of the Spirit (ἐν τούτῳ): ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν. Neither οὐ ch. iii. 24, nor the preposition ἐκ here, has partitive force; it rather answers to ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος, Acts ii. 17; Joël iii. 1 (LXX.), while the Vulgate in conformity to the original text renders *spiritum meum effundam*, and denotes the origin and source of the Spirit in us, although we, as distinguished from Jesus who has the Spirit οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου (Jno. iii. 34), have only part in Him; the coarse notion of a divisibility or dismemberment of the Spirit must be strenuously excluded. The Spirit Himself is given to us; nothing is said here of His gifts; there is no reference to the διαιρέσεις τῶν χαρισμάτων, 1 Cor. xii. 4, 11—(in opposition to Estius). His Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, the Love-Spirit of God) answers to ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ and confirms the explanation of v. 12, as given above, and supplements the fact that His Spirit mediates in us His love and its perfections.

Evidence of this inward life-fellowship as a certain fact. vv. 14, 15, 16.

VER. 14. **And we have beheld and testify.**—Antithesis to v. 12: No one has ever beheld God, but we have seen the Son of the Father. Ἡμεῖς designates the Apostles and their associates, and this reference is confirmed by τεθεάμεθα καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν, which verbs point to an immediate, personal beholding as contrasted with the knowledge mediated by others (ch. i. 1, 2; Jno. i. 14), to their eye- and ear-witness (Jno. i. 34). What they have beheld, *that they* testify also; both verbs have the same object:

That the Father hath sent the Son as Saviour of the world.—In Jesus, the Sent One from God, they have beheld δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρὸς, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας (Jno. i. 14), and therefore they beheld Him as the Sent One of God. Τοῦ κόσμου (cf. ch. ii. 2; Jno. iii. 16; iv. 42), implies that He is sent for every man, not only for the *electi in omnibus populis* (Piscator); the universality of salvation is also confirmed by the sequel:

VER. 15. **Whosoever confesseth that Jesus is the Son of God.**—This ὁμολογεῖν is the consequence of the reception of the μαρτυρεῖν of the Apostles. Cf. ch. ii. 2, 23. The reference here is neither to the confession in the fact of brotherly love (Bede), nor to the testimony of a holy life accompanying the confession with the mouth (Augustine, Grotius); but the faith of the heart, which receives the Apostolical μαρτυρία is taken for granted. Cf. v. 16.

God abideth in Him and He in God.—The confession, therefore, is to be taken as connected with the life-fellowship with God, and an ungodly conversation surely will not belie the confession; God in Christ Jesus will have appropriated salvation to the believer.

VER. 16. **And we have known and believed.**—The beginning καὶ ἡμεῖς exactly as in v. 14. But ἐγνώκαμεν and πεπιστεύκαμεν is matter of the disciples of Jesus without any exception whatsoever (Estius, Calov, Spener, Lücke, de Wette, Düsterdieck, Ebrard, Huther), not of the Apostles only, as in τεθεάμεθα καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν (in opposition to Episcopius, Rickli and al.). Cf. Jno. vi. 69: πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν; cf. Lange in this Commentary, Vol. IV., p. 166, German edition. "True faith is, according to John, a faith of knowledge and experience: true knowledge of faith" (Lücke); both are in one another; each conditions and promotes the other. Hence it is really immaterial which of the two is put first; the moral act of faith and the intellectual act of knowing are ultimately not without the working of God in His Spirit on our spirit. For the reception of the word of truth in faith is a receiving from the Lord of the word, just as the shining of this bright word into the heart and the luminous rise of the truth of the word in the heart, come also from Him. The two constitute the foundation of man's confession. Hence the Perfects which continue to operate in the present confession. The object follows, viz.:

The love which God hath in us.—Cf. Jno. xiii. 35: ἵνα ἀγάπην ἔχητε ἐν ἀλλήλοις. The Present is emphatically placed first after the preceding Perfects; ἐν is used here as in v. 9. It is, as in Jno. vi. 69 (ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ), something objective, God's love *on* us, namely in Christ Jesus, wherefore Bede says: "*Quia videlicet cum haberet filium unicum, noluit illum esse unum, sed ut fratres haberet, adoptavit illi, qui cum illo possiderent vitam æternam.*" Hence neither the subjective love of God *erga nos* (Estius, Luther, Socinus, Grotius, Rickli and al.), nor the love of God indwelling in us (Wilke, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*, 11, 64,), nor our love, kindled in us by God's love (Ebrard).—Now follows the concluding summary,

God is love and he that abideth in love, abideth in God and God abideth in him.—A combination of vv. 8 and 15. Ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ denotes Love absolute, as the element of those who are born of God, and neither brotherly love (Lücke and al.), nor God's love to us (Ebrard); it occurs here without any qualifying addition. Μένων, however, denotes the love of man in which he abides and which dwells in him.

Perfecting of love in fearlessness. vv. 17, 18.

VER. 17. **In this, love is perfected with us.**—Ἀγάπη is again absolute as in vv. 16, 18, and must neither be construed as God's love εἰς ἡμᾶς, nor as our love εἰς ἀλλήλους (Socinus), nor to God (Lange), but simultaneously as the disposition and activity of love (Huther), as at ch. iii. 18; and μεθ' ἡμῶν must receive its full force of among, between, with us; see Winer, p. 336 sq.—Were it not parallel with ἐν ἡμῖν v. 12 we might think of fellowship, ecclesiastical fellowship, the Christian Church, within which love has been perfected; the context also points to the individual life and perfection of *Christians* and not to the life and perfection of the Christian

Church as such. Its most natural construction is with the verb τετελείωται (Lücke, de Wette, Düsterdieck and al.), not with ἀγάπη, of which it cannot be the object, since it is not=εἰς ἡμᾶς, as supposed by Luther, Calvin, Spener, Bengel, Sander, Besser and al. The position of the words is not more decisive for the connection with ἀγάπη here than at v. 9 (in opposition to Huther); μεθ' ἡμῶν denotes the place where love was perfected. Hence ἡμῶν must not be resolved into *God* and *we* (Rickli) and construed as the mutual love of God and Christians, which would be wholly inadmissible and repugnant to the spirit of the Gospel. Τετελείωται should be construed like τετελειωμένη ἐστίν, v. 12, and τελεία and τετελείωται in v. 18, this ἀγάπη in and on us is something to be perfected, and this perfection itself is not ready and accomplished at once; it has its stages and degrees. This is inconceivable and unpredicable of the love of God. But wherein is it primarily perfected? ἐν τούτῳ—ἵνα παῤῥησίαν ἔχωμεν:

That we have confidence in the day of judgment.—On παῤῥησία see Notes on ch. ii. 28 in *Exegetical and Critical.* Ἵνα, which follows αὕτη, ch. iii. 11, 23; Jno. xvii. 3 and also ἐν τούτῳ, Jno. xv. 8, gives the purpose of God in the perfecting of love with us; we *shall* have confidence. Ἐν τούτῳ therefore must neither be referred to what goes before v. 16 (Spener), nor, with the assumption of a *trajecta anticipatio*, connected with ὅτι (Grotius, Beza and al.), nor must ἵνα be construed in the sense of ὥστε (Episcopius, Bengel and al.). The ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως is ὅταν φανερωθῇ ch. ii. 28. Of course ἐν has its usual sense and must not be explained=εἰς; for the reference here is not to the confidence of expectation, the desire of its drawing near (Augustine, Calvin), where men are liable to deceive themselves. Of course, he that may and will have confidence *in* the judgment, will also have confidence *before* it takes place; however, it is to be borne in mind that even believers, notwithstanding their activity of love, will be surprised in the judgment (Matth. xxv. 31 sqq.); the reference is solely to confidence in the judgment, not to confidence beforehand. It is incorrect to combine the two with Rickli, Huther and al.; nor must τετελείωται be taken as a *futurum exactum.* [It is doubtful whether Braune's exegesis will carry conviction to the mind of the reader. It seems to be rather contradictory, for while he condemns the interpretation of Rickli and Huther, he seems to adopt it when he says that "of course he that may and will have confidence *in* the judgment, will also have confidence *before* it takes place." On the whole, Huther's explanation, which is substantially that of Alford, seems to be the most natural. He says: "The difficulty that something future (our attitude in the day of judgment), is to be valid as a mark of perfect love in the present, vanishes by the assumption that ἐν involves both the παῤῥησία of believers in the day of judgment, and their present παῤῥησία in anticipation of that day; this combination was natural to the Apostle who thought of the day of judgment not as very remote but as already dawning (ch. ii. 18). In his love this future παῤῥησία is to him already present."—M.].

Because as He is, we also are in this world.—Ὅτι annexes the reason of our confidence in the day of judgment. Ἐκεῖνος is Jesus and not God (Augustine, Calvin and al.). The Present ἐστί must not be construed=ἦν (a Lapide, Grotius, Rickli and al.), nor must the words ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ be referred to Christ. The comparison must be gathered from the context: it is very strict, καθὼς—καί. The point in hand is the μένειν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, which μένειν perfects love even unto filial confidence in the day of judgment (so Huther who cites Lorinus, "*reddit nos caritas Christo similes et conformes imagini filii Dei*"). Hence not likeness in suffering (Luther) or temptability (Rickli), not likeness in that, though we are in the world, we are not of the world (Sander); for nothing is said on these points; neither is here any reference to the adoption (Lücke), nor to δικαιοσύνη (Düsterdieck). Love is the eternal Being of Christ, cf. ch. iii. 7 (Huther). [The last named author lays stress on ἐστὶν and compares in the passage cited the words: καθὼς ἐκεῖνος δίκαιός ἐ σ τ ι ν.—Alford adopts the explanation of Düsterdieck, who thus develops his view: St. John does not say that Love is perfected in confidence in us, because we resemble Christ in Love; but he refers to the fundamental truth on which our Love itself rests and says: because we are absolutely like Christ, because we are in Christ Himself, because He lives in us, for without this there cannot be likeness to Him; in a word, because we are, in that communion with Christ which we are assured of by our likeness to Him in righteousness, children of God, therefore our love brings with it also full confidence. Essentially, the reason here rendered for our confidence in the day of judgment is the same as that given, ch. iii. 21 sq., for another kind of confidence, viz., that we keep His commandments. This also betokens the δικαιοσύνη, of which Christ is the essential exemplar and which is a necessary attribute of those who through Christ are children of God.—M.]. Ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ applied to ἐσμέν, denotes the place of abode, the earthly sphere of life, whereas Christ is in heaven, and is not an ethical idea, though we should supply with Bengel: *amoris experte judicium timente.*

VER. 18. **Fear is not in love.**—Antithesis of παῤῥησία ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως. Quite general: In love is not fear; fear is not a part of love, it is something wholly foreign to it, which is only outside of it (Huther). According to the well known phrase: *oderint, dum metuant,* hatred and fear are congruous, but love and fear are wholly incongruous. There is nothing said of the fear of God which is the beginning of wisdom (Ps. cxi. 10), nor of love; hence neither our love to God, nor brotherly love (Lücke), and still less God's love to us (Calvin, Calov, Spener).

But perfect love casteth out fear.—Τελεία is more than *sincera, opposita simulationi* (Beza), and ἔξω is not out of itself (Lücke), as if it were in it, but out of the heart. "Love not only does not contain fear, but it also does not suffer it alongside of itself; the love which wholly drives away fear is not love in its first beginning, love as yet weak, but love in its perfection." (Huther). [Alford says of ἀλλά that it is not here the mere adversative after a negative clause, in which case it would refer to something in which fear *is, e. g.* φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ,

ἀλλ' (ἐστιν) ἐν τῷ μισεῖ: but it is the stronger adversative, implying, "nay, far otherwise:" "*tantum abest ut . . . . ut;*" and renders: Fear *existeth* not in love, *nay*, perfect love casteth out fear, etc.—M.].—Where such love fills the heart, there is no room for fear,

Because fear hath punishment.—This is the reason why love does not suffer fear alongside itself. Κόλασις often used in the LXX., [Ez. xiv. 3, 4, 7; xviii. 30; xliv. 12, cf. Wisd. xi. 14; xvi. 2, 24; xix. 4.—M.], as in Matth. xxv. 46 in the sense of punishment, pain of punishment (Besser) under the menace of the κρίσις. Bengel: "*tormentum habet; nam diffidit, omnia inimica et adversa sibi fingit ac proponit, fugit, odit.*" Hence it is not consciousness of punishment (Lücke), for the punishment has not yet set in; nor condemnation pronounced in the final judgment on him who does not stand in the fellowship of love (Düsterdieck). Ὁ φόβος is neither *pro concreto:* he that fears (de Wette, Düsterdieck), nor is ἔχει=receives; and least of all: fear holds fast to, *tenet*, thinks of punishment, knows nothing of clemency and love (Baumgarten-Crusius).—["The pain felt in expectation of the punishment of Him who is feared" (Huther); "Fear by anticipating punishment has it even now" (Alford).—M.].

But he that feareth is not perfected in love.—Negative connected with the main proposition: ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη ἔξω βάλλει τὸν φόβον, and application to the beginning: φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. Hence δὲ is by all means to be retained, and neither to be cancelled, nor to be construed=οὖν or καὶ [δὲ is strictly adversative. —M.]. It is accordingly both owing to a want of perfection in the individual and to a want of perfection of love (τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ—ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη), if fear is present, fear, as in Rom. viii. 15: οὐκ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον. Unnecessary [and diluting—M.] are the conjectures of Grotius, who proposes to read κόλουσιν (*mutilationem*) instead of κόλασιν (*metus amorem mutilat atque infringit, aut prohibet, ne se exserat*), and κολουόμενος instead of φοβούμενος (*qui mutilatur aut impeditur in dilectione*), and of Lamb. Bos who reads κώλυσιν instead of κόλασιν. [Oecumenius says that there are two kinds of godly fear, φόβος προκαταρκτικός, which afflicts men with a sense of their evil deeds and dread of God's anger, and which is not abiding; and φόβος τελειωτικός, of which it is said, "The fear of the Lord is clean and endureth forever." Ps. xix., and which δέους τοιούτου ἀπήλλακται.—M.].

The love of God is necessarily united with brotherly love. vv. 19, 20, 21.

VER. 19. **We love God.**—Φοβούμενος is contrasted with ἡμεῖς ἀγαπῶμεν θεόν, without an address, like ἀγαπητοί, v. 7. There is nothing here to indicate the Conjunctive or an exhortation. Ἡμεῖς,—emphatically placed first, who are born of God, His children,—rather notes the fact, the Indicative (Calvin, Beza, Aretius, Socinus, Spener, S. Schmidt, Bengel, Rickli, Neander, Ebrard, Erdmann, Huther, Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* II. 2. 338); it corresponds, like the whole verse 19, with οὐχ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠγαπήσαμεν τὸν θεόν. Neither the comparison with v. 7, nor the ground and the further development in vv. 20, 21, can warrant the interpretation that we must assume here an imperative Conjunctive (as Düsterdieck does). For the majority of authorities favour the addition of the object, even the οὖν of A. implies as much. [Alford, who is on the same side, fixes the connection thus: "He that feareth is not perfect in love. Our love (abstract, not specified whether to God or our brother) is brought about by, conditioned by, depends upon His love to us first; it is only a sense of that which can bring about our love: and if so, then from the very nature of things it is void of terror, and full of confidence, as springing out of a sense of His love to us. Nor only so: our being new begotten in love is not only the effect of *a sense of* His past love, but is the effect of that love itself."—M.]. In the ground

Because He first loved us, πρῶτος is emphatic, and this seems to suggest a primary reference to our love to God, cf. vv. 9, 10. From our most natural love to God, grounded on our experience of the love of God, the Apostle now passes on to brotherly love.

VER. 20. **If any say, I love God, and hate his brother, he is a liar.**—Ἐάν τις εἴπῃ, cf. ch. i. 6; ὅτι before ἀγαπῶ τὸν θεόν frequently introduces direct speech. This progress confirms the assumption of the Indicative in v. 19. Here the Apostle resolves the communicate form of speech into the singular form as a conclusion and proof. Μισῇ answers to the next following ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν. Cf. ch. iii. 14, 15. "To hate is the positive form of not to love." (Huther). Cf. Luke xiv. 26. *Col.* Matth. x. 37. Every defect of love makes room to hatred. Hence ψεύστης ἐστί, as in ch. i. 6. The reason:

For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God (or cannot love God) whom he hath not seen?—The main stress lies in the antithesis ὃν ἑώρακεν and ὃν οὐχ' ἑώρακεν. The Perfect denotes sight continuing in its effect (de Wette, Düsterdieck, Huther); Lücke: ἑωρακέναι=to have before one's eyes; a Lapide: *vidit et assidue videt.* Socinus goes too far in emphasizing the Perfect so as to make it also intimate that it is enough to have seen and become acquainted with one, and that it is not necessary to have him still before one's eyes. The saying of Gregory: *oculi sunt in amore duces*, and the remark of Oecumenius: ἐφελκυστικὸν ὅρασις πρὸς ἀγάπην, supply what is understood in the inference. Love to God, the Invisible, is difficult; also 1 Pet. i. 8: ὃν οὐκ εἰδότες ἀγαπᾶτε express both joy and amazement. He therefore who performs the more difficult task of loving God whom he does not see, must also perform the easier work of loving his brother whom he does see. The Apostle's object, consequently, is not to lead us from the love to our brother to the love of God, but only to verify the latter by the former; love to God ever remains the first, the deepest and highest work, which must, however, evidence itself in brotherly love. The interrogative form is as strong and authentic as the simple negation; but the anteposition of the object τὸν θεὸν ὃν οὐχ ἑώρακεν greatly intensifies the thought. Πῶς or οὐ δύναται ἀγαπᾷν presupposes ἐάν τις εἴπῃ and denotes the supposition of the assertion of loving God [under the circumstances.—M.] to be impossible, and the assertion itself a lie. The Apostle's *argumentum ad hominem* applies only to the liar (Düsterdieck).

Bengel: *Sermo modalis; impossibile est, ut talis sit amans Dei, in præsenti.* Hence the reference to the *imago Dei*, which Augustine (*apostolus hic pro confesso sumit, Deus se nobis in hominibus offerre, qui inscriptam gerunt ejus imaginem; Johannes nil aliud voluit, quam fallacem esse jactantiam, si quis Deum se amare dicat, et ejus imaginem, quæ ante oculos est, negligat*), Sander, Ebrard (who suggests that it is not easier to love one who is visible before us, but has *hurt* us) and al., find here is by no means warranted, nor that of Grotius who calls man *opus Dei pulcherrimum.* De Wette also erroneously maintains that God, the ideal, invisible object could *only* be loved in reality in our brother, the visible, empirical object of love.

Ver. 21. **And this commandment we have from Him.**—Καὶ simply adds a new reason: the reference is to a specific commandment. This is a *firmius argumentum* (Calvin): for *quomodo diligis eum, cujus odisti præceptum?* (Augustine). 'Απ' αὐτοῦ refers to God (Lücke, de Wette, Düsterdieck and al.), not to Christ (Calvin), Sander, Huther and al.). The fact that θεὸν is used afterwards does not militate against the application of αὐτοῦ to θεὸν, since Jesus in His intercessory prayer Jno. xvii, 3 mentions His own name instead of saying ἐμέ. The analogy of ch. i. 5; ii. 25 can not upset the context and ch. iii. 23. 24, and only indicate that αὐτὸς also may designate Christ, and that not ἐκεῖνος only does designate Him. The ἐντολή is and remains a commandment, and not=ἀγγελία, doctrine (Carpzov).

That he who loveth God, love his brother also.—But this commandment is nowhere found; not even at Matth xxii. 39. But the Apostle justly puts in the form of a definite Divine command the essential principle of Christian Ethics, which really and fundamentally carries everything which here (v. 7 sqq. iii. 10. 19. cf. Jno. xiii. 34, etc.) is told of the inviolable duty of brotherly love to those who are born of God and in filial love united to their Father (Düsterdieck); ἵνα denotes also here the end and aim and not only the substance of the command, as Huther supposes.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *God* is **Love**—a sentence, which "is the summary and most simple expression of what the Scripture, the whole Scripture teaches throughout" (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* I. p. 71), and has an important bearing retrospectively and prospectively. *Retrospectively* it bears even on the *Being of God* and on the *history of God's revelation* in Christ Jesus. If the Being of God is *Love* it must also be *personal* and cannot be substance only in the pantheistic sense. Yea, it points to the *Trinity* or God's vitality and fulness of life; Him that *loves*, who is yet not without Him that is LOVED, and *reciprocal Love*, as Augustine tried also this purely ethical construction of the Trinity alongside the psychological analogy (*memoria, intelligentia, voluntas*) in *De Trinitate* (VI. 5: and therefore there are not more than three: One who loves Him who is of Him, and One who loves Him of whom He is, and Love Itself. If this is nothing, how is God Love? If it is not Substance, how is God Substance? XI. 2: If I love something there are three,—I, what I love, and Love itself. For I do not love Love, if I do not love Him that loveth, for love is not where nothing is loved); hence he could, according to Rom. v. 5, understand in our passage (v. 7) by ἀγάπη the Holy Ghost, while Didymus explained ἀγάπη of Christ. In the middle ages Augustine was particularly followed by Richard of St. Victor, the mystic scholastic, or the scholastic mystic (cf. Liebner, *Hugo von St. Victor* p. 82 sqq.), in his work *De Trinitate*, especially III. 14—and in modern times, first of all, by Sartorius: *Die heilige Liebe*, Part I. p. 1 sqq., and Liebner: *Christologie* I (in many places). See also Nitzsch on the Essential Trinity of God in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1841, pp. 295—345, especially p. 337 sqq.

2. *Retrospectively*, traces of this truth may be found in the *History of the Revelation of God* in Ex. xxxiv. 6; Ps. ciii. 8–13; lxxxvi. 5, 15; Deut. xxxii. 6; Is. lxiii. 16; Jer. xxxi. 9. But John treats in the most comprehensive manner, with perfect ease and certainty this most profound thought which would never have occurred to any thinker out of his own strength and reason! The heavens declare the glory and majesty of God only, (Ps. xix.) His word alone declares His grace. In nature we meet His handiwork, His Power and Wisdom, in His word alone do we encounter His Love and Mercy. The axioms "God is a Spirit" (Jno. iv. 24), and "God is Love" set forth the most vital truths concerning the Nature and Being of God.—"Spirit is His Nature, Love His Life" (Schöberlein), or Spirit is the Substance and Nature, Love the character of God and not only in His attitude.

3. *Prospectively* this Johannean saying points to the life of knowledge and of demeanour. Sartorius in his "*Heilige Liebe*" has based on this saying the whole of his Ethics. Cf. also Köhler, "*Gott der allein Gute*" (God the Only Good One) in *Studien und Kritiken* 1856, p, 426 sqq. "*Practicam definitionem Dei proponit* 1 Joh. iv. 8: *Deus caritas est. Ex caritate omnia Dei opera procedunt, et Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio ab æterno procedens est substantialis amor Patris et Filii. In tempore Deus ex caritate omnia creavit, ex caritate misit Filium ad opus redemtionis: præstandum, ex caritate dat Spiritum Sanctum, qui similes motus in cordibus credentium accendit, ex caritate in vita æterna a facie ad faciem beatis sese intuendum præstabit.—Omnia in caritate et ex caritate agit* (Joh. Gerhard *Exeg.* ii. p. 71). But we must guard against straightway identifying Love, which is the Nature of God, with the Personality of God which is the logical presupposition of the former (against Liebner, i. 1, 111), and to take care not to combine Love with Truth and Righteousness (as does Nitzsch, *System* § 68. 1), for communication of self is implied in the nature of Love, but not in the nature of truth and holiness, and what becomes of the difference between παιδεία and κόλασις, of the anti-scriptural conception of ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων and the wrathless God in Origen and Schleiermacher? Cf. Thomasius, *Christi Werk und Person*, i. p. 127 sqq.; Philippi, *Glaubenslehre*, ii. p. 79 sqq.

4. The love of God was *revealed in the sending of His only begotten Son.* vv. 2, 9, 10, 12, 14. Hence He is called μονογενής=μόνος γεννώμενος (Jno. i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18), and not πρωτότοκος (Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 15, 18; Hebr. i. 6; Rev

i. 5). The greatness of the Sent One and the object of His Mission are designed to mark the love of Him that sent Him. The reference to the first-born would mark the success of the Mission and the work of the Sent One. There is no other proof of the love of the Father, equal to this: Christ, the Son of God by His appearing and message compensates us for the want of seeing the Invisible God (v. 12. Jno. xiv. 9). Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 71.

5. To see, know, believe on, confess and testify of Jesus the Son of God on the part of the Apostles, to hear, know, believe and confess on the part of the Church, is indispensable to the life-fellowship of God with us, and of us with God, since, through and through ethical, it can only be acquired and preserved by an ethical process. With the new birth out of God, spiritual regeneration, begins the life-process of sanctification. To remain untouched, unmoved in the presence of Jesus, or only to be turned to Him outwardly, or even to turn away from Him, to deny Him in doubt or decided unbelief, is immorality.

6. The nature of this life-fellowship, begun with our regeneration, is mutuality in continuous reciprocity of action; He to and in us, we in Him, believingly knowing and confessing Him, living and loving, we full of confidence, He in His ever prevenient grace and work of grace to and in us.

7. The degrees of development are given by Bengel thus: "*Sine timore et amore, cum timore sine amore, cum timore et amore, sine timore cum amore.*" And Augustine: "*Timor quasi locum præparat caritati. Si autem nullus timor, non est, qua intret caritas. Timor Dei sic vulnerat, quo medici ferramentum. Timor medicamentum, caritas sanitas. Timor servus est caritatis. Timor est custos et pædagogus legis, donec veniat caritas.*" Though man in his sin begin with servile fear before God, in the presence of God's Nature of Love and attitude of Love he will progress in filial fear even unto fearlessness and confidence in all humility.

8. Brotherly love is and remains the measure of our life from God, from whom comes all love; he that abides in God, cannot be without love, and he that is without love cannot be in God, nor can God abide in him. He, who is Love, has thus ordained it Himself; it is His Will, His explicit commandment, even as it is in conformity with His Nature.

9. [Wordsworth on v. 10: "A statement of the doctrine of the *Atonement*, and a statement the more remarkable, because it *anticipates* the *objections* that have been made to it in later times.—These objections have taken the following form. *God*, it is said, *is Love* (1 Jno. iv. 8). He loves us, and He loves His *only-begotten* Son. We are sinners; and as long as we are sinners, and without pardon from God, we have no hope of heaven. As sinners we owe an *infinite debt* to God, which we can never pay. But God is *infinite in Love*; He willeth *not that any should perish* (2 Pet. iii. 9), but *that all should be saved* (1 Tim. ii. 4). He can forgive us the debt. He can do this freely. To suppose that He cannot do so, is to set limits to His Omnipotence. To imagine that He will not do so, is to disparage His Love. To allege, that He will require an *equivalent* for the debt, is to represent the God of mercy as a rigorous exactor, and to believe that He required *such a price* for our pardon, as the *blood of His own beloved Son*, and that He exposed Him who is *perfectly innocent*, to the death of the cross for *our sakes*, at the hands of wicked men, is to charge God with cruelty, injustice and weakness; and to suppose Him to be *angry* with us, at the same time that we say that "He *loved* us," and gave His only Son to die for us (1 Jno. iii. 16; iv. 10), is, it is alleged, to involve ourselves in inconsistency, and to misrepresent God, as if He were affected by human passions. And lastly, to say that Christ shed His blood as a ransom to deliver us *from the captivity* of Satan, is, it is argued, to make the Son of God tributary to the Evil One. Such are the objections made by Socinians and others, to the doctrine of the Atonement.—These objections rest on fallacious grounds. They proceed on the supposition that as sinners we are only *debtors* to God. But in His relation to us, God is not only a *Creditor*, but He is our *Lawgiver* and *Judge*, our *King* and *Lord;* and He is perfectly *just* and *holy*.

Besides, as St. John teaches (ch. iii. 4), the essence of *sin* is, that it is a violation of God's *Law*, and *all* are sinners (ch. i. 10). And God represents Himself in Scripture as a Moral Governor, infinite in justice, and when we contemplate *Him* as He is represented by Himself in His own Word, and when we regard *sin* as it is in His sight, and as it is described in the Holy Scriptures, we must conclude that He is grievously offended by sin; and He has declared in His word that He *is* angry with it and will punish it. The *wrath* of God is *revealed* against *all ungodliness* (Rom. i. 18). The wages of sin is death (Rom. vi. 23).—But this proposition is not at variance, as has been alleged, with St. John's declaration, that God *loved us*, and sent His *own Son*, the only *begotten*, that we *might live through Him;* and that herein consists *Love*, not *that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son a propitiation for our sins.*

That which God loved in us was *not* our *sin*, but our *nature*. It was *that* nature which God Himself had made in His own likeness, and which we had marred, and which He desired to repair. And because He hates sin, and knows its consequences, even death eternal, and because He loved our nature which was exposed by it to everlasting perdition; and because being infinitely just, He must punish sin, which He, who is infinitely pure, must hate, and which He who is infinitely true, has declared that He will punish; and because the sins of the whole world are so heinous, and because they demand a satisfaction infinite in value, and because *without shedding of blood there is no remission* (Heb. ix. 22); therefore, in His immense love for our nature, which He had made and which we had marred by sin, He sent His own Son, God of God, to *take that Nature*, the Nature of *us all*, in order to be the substitute of *all*, and Saviour of *all*, and to become our *Emmanuel, God with us* (Matth. i. 23), *God manifest in the flesh* (1 Tim. iii. 16), partaking of our flesh and blood and to be the *Lord our Righteousness* (Jer. xxiii. 6; xxxiii. 16), and to suffer death, the wages of sin, in our nature, as our Proxy

and Representative, and to *appease God's wrath* by an adequate *propitiation*, and to take away our guilt, and to *redeem* us from bondage and death by the priceless *ransom* of His own blood, and to deliver us by His death from him who had the power of it, even the devil, and to reconcile us to God, and to restore us to His favour, and to effect our *atonement* with Him, and to purchase for us the heavenly inheritance of everlasting life. See Heb. ii. 14, 17.—As Origen says (in Matth. xvi.): "Homo *quidem non potest dare aliquam commutationem pro animâ suâ* (Ps. xlix. 9; Matth. xvi. 26); Deus *autem pro* animabus omnium dedit *commutationem, pretiosum sanguinem Filii sui* (1 Pet. i. 18)." "*Si non fuisset peccatum, non necesse fuerat Filium Dei Agnum fieri; nec opus fuerat Eum in carne positum jugulari; sed mansisset hoc, quod in principio erat, Deus Verbum. Verum, quoniam introiit peccatum in hunc mundum, peccati autem necessitas* propitiationem *requirit, et propitiatio non fit nisi per* hostiam, *necessarium fuit provideri hostiam pro peccato*." (ibid. hom. 4 in Num.) If it be said that according to this statement the *just suffer for the unjust*, and that the beloved Son of God was delivered to death for the offences of those who did not love Him, but were at enmity with Him, this is perfectly true; it is the assertion of God Himself in Holy Scripture, see 1 Pet. iii. 18; 2 Cor. v. 21; 1 Pet. i. 19.—The Just suffered for the unjust. Yes, suffered for a *time*. But this is not at variance with daily experience. Parents suffer for children; brethren for brethren; friends for friends; subjects for sovereigns, and sovereigns for subjects. And if we are to reject the doctrine of the Atonement on the plea that *vicarious* sufferings are not reconcilable with justice, we cannot stop short of Deism or even of Atheism. Cf. Bp. Butler's *Analogy of Religion*. Part II. ch. v.

If any victim was to take away sin, that victim must be innocent. In order to take away infinite guilt, it must be infinitely innocent. The price paid for Infinite Justice must be infinite in value. In order to suffer for men the victim must be human; and in order to satisfy God, it must be Divine. Be it remembered also that the Son of God suffered *willingly*. He *gave* Himself a ransom for all (1 Tim. ii. 6). The Good Shepherd *giveth* His life for the sheep (John x. 11). Cf. Matth. xx. 28; Gal. i. 4; ii. 20; Eph. v. 2; Tit. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 14.—They also for whom He gave Himself are His own flesh and blood. He is their Head, they His members. They are one with Him.—Still further.—By His meritorious sufferings in that human nature, which He has taken, and joined forever in His own Person to the Nature of God, He has delivered that nature from sin and death, and has exalted it to the right hand of God. Therefore He suffered *joyfully*. To *do* evil is indeed evil; and to *suffer* evil in *eternity*, is dreadful; but to *suffer* evil *in time*, in order that others by our means may be happy in eternity, is not evil, but glorious. Earthly conquerors die with joy in the hour of victory. Much more Christ. He knew that suffering was His path to glory. He knew that *because he was obedient to death, even to the death of the cross, therefore God would highly exalt Him, and give Him a Name above every name* (Phil. ii. 8, 9). He saw of the travail of His soul and *was satisfied* (Is. liii. 11). Doubtless, in His human flesh He shrank from the cup of agony and from the anguish of the cross. But even in the glorious hour of His transfiguration He had talked with Moses and Elias of His *death* (Luke ix. 31). His Divine eye pierced through the clouds of suffering, and saw the visions of glory to which it would lead, a victory over Satan, a world rescued from his grasp, God's justice satisfied, His wrath appeased, His love glorified; and so the cross became a triumphal chariot, in which the Conqueror rode in victory (Col. ii. 14), and mounted to heaven, and bore mankind with Him through the gates of the heavenly palace of the everlasting capital and was greeted by the song of the angels, "Lift up your heads," etc. Ps. xxiv. 7.

It has been alleged that if by sin we were prisoners to *Satan*, therefore the price of Christ's blood which He paid upon the cross for our liberation from Satan was *paid to Satan*. But this we deny. See Greg. Nazianzen, Orat. 45, p. 862, ed. Paris, 1778. It might as well be said that the ransom paid for the delivery of prisoners from a king's prison, is paid to the gaoler in whose custody they are. We, by our sins, had made ourselves slaves of Satan; and as a just punishment for our sins, we were made prisoners of Satan. Satan was God's executioner against us. He was our gaoler. *Tophet is ordained of old* (Is. xxx. 33), *as one of God's instruments of death* (Ps. vii. 14). But Christ, by dying for us, delivered us from death. He rescued us from the hands of Satan, and paid the price of our ransom, not to Satan, but *to God*. He delivered us from Satan by offering Himself to God. (Cf. Rom. iii. 23–26).

They who contravene the doctrine of the Atonement often claim the credit of exercising their *Reason*, and deny that unbelief of the doctrine of the Atonement rests on the foundation of reason. But a *right use* of reason leads to a firm belief in the doctrine of the Atonement; and a denial of it proceeds from an *abuse* of reason.—

The doctrine of the Atonement cannot be *discovered* by reason. No; but we can prove by reason that the Holy Scriptures are from God, and that the doctrine of the Atonement is clearly revealed in the Holy Scriptures. And thus this doctrine rests on the foundation of reason. Being a portion of *supernatural* truth revealed by God in Scripture to the world, it is not to be *discovered* by reason, or fully *comprehended* by reason, but it is to be heartily embraced and surely held fast by *faith*, which *implies a right use of reason*. And reason teaches us, that it would be very unreasonable to expect, that what is contained in a revelation from such a Being as God to so frail a creature as man, in his present state on earth, should be fully comprehended by reason; and that, if reason could understand everything, there would be no use in revelation, and no place for faith. Right reason itself teaches us that to *deny the Lord who bought us* (2 Pet. ii. 1), because we cannot *understand*, why God allowed sin to prevail, which required the sacrifice of the death of His own ever-blessed Son, would be to renew the indignities of the crucifixion, and to smite our Redeemer with a reed, the reed of our unregenerate reason, when we ought to fall down and worship in faith. Reason itself teaches us that it is very reasonable to expect mysteries in reve-

lation; and that they are our *moral discipline*, and exercise our humility, patience, faith and hope, and teach us to look forward to that blessed time, when we, who now see through *a glass darkly* (1 Cor. xiii. 12), shall behold the clouds removed, etc. Thus reason leads us to the door of the Holy of Holies; and then we pass within the veil by faith; and there we stand, and with the eye of faith, we behold God enthroned upon the Mercy Seat, *sprinkled by the blood of Christ*. Further, as reasonable men, looking at the cross of Christ, we see there the most cogent reasons for *presenting* ourselves, our souls and bodies *a living Sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is our reasonable service* (Rom. xii. 1).

This *doctrine* of the Atonement is the root of Christian *practice*, and they, who impugn that doctrine, are not only undermining the foundations of Christian *faith*, but also of Christian *morality*. This was clearly evinced even in the Apostolic age, by the licentiousness and profligacy, engendered by heretical doctrines, against which St. John contends in his Epistles, concerning the Incarnation and Death of Christ.

We cannot adequately estimate the moral heinousness of sin, without considering the sacrifice which it cost to redeem us from its power and guilt. We cannot duly understand the obligations of love and obedience, under which we lie to Christ, and the motives which constrain us to holiness, without remembering that we are *not our own*, but *have been bought with a price*—the blood of Christ—and are therefore bound to glorify Him in our bodies which are His. See 1 Cor. vi. 20.

Accordingly, St. John, having stated the doctrine of the Atonement, proceeds and continues to the end of the Epistle, to enforce the *moral duties* consequent on this *doctrine*. "Beloved, if God so *loved us*, *we* also ought to *love one another*." He teaches us to contend earnestly for the doctrine of the Atonement, as the groundwork of Christian duty to God and man. Cf. Pearson on the Creed, art. x. pp. 670–688.—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In love, even in God's glorious Love thou livest—well, let love live also in thee!—the primal fount of the Love in God streams round thee, and onward to thee, also through thy heart; wilt thou enjoy it without having part thereof?—*Out of thee* must shine forth that which has been manifested *to thee*, even the love and kindness of God thy Saviour, which seeks that which is lost. *Brotherly love* must grow warm in *filial love* which has been kindled at the Father's heart.—In thy child people recognize a member of thy family, thy race; and ought not our heavenly Father to be recognized in thee? Therefore exercise thyself in love of the brethren!—Dost thou boast of thy knowledge of God, of understanding the Holy Scripture? prove it in thy brotherly love!—In nature thou seest His handiwork, the traces of His Omnipotence, in Christ the love-purpose of His heart, His peace-thoughts respecting thee (cf. *Doctrinal and Ethical* No. 2). He takes care that thy sins be atoned for, that thou become not estranged from Him, or keep remote from His life; do not build anew at the wall of partition between Him and thee; such building destroys thy life and thy salvation.—The anticipating offices of friendship are gratifying and humiliating; realize and receive the prevenient grace of God.—As He took the initiative in creation, so He had to take it also in redemption, which is also a creation; and how has He done it! Though without thee He could create thee, yet He neither can nor will save thee without thee.—Above thee rules thy Father, for thee the Son is sent, in thee works His Spirit; do not hinder the work of God for and in thee; do not in unkindness to thyself and thy brethren arrest the perfecting of His work of love.—Do not reject the testimony of eye- and ear-witnesses; surrender to it, receive it in faith, hold it fast in confession; exercise thyself in the love which thou believest and knowest. For to be unloving is to be ungodly, and to be ungodly is to be unloving. If thou art disposed to disparage confession, recollect that like love it radiates from faith; confession is the love of the mouth, love is the confession of the deed, and both come from the heart.—Behind the judgments in the world's history and in the history of thy life, there is a judgment, to stand in which is salvation and bliss.—The unloving must be undone in the judgment of Him who is Love, before the Judge who desired to become the Saviour.—That cannot be our desire in life which does not give us confidence in the last judgment.—Fear, which does not strengthen but expels love, is worthless; so is also that love, which is unable to overcome fear (cf. *Doctrinal and Ethical*, No. 7).—Brotherly love, in comparison with the love of God, is as inferior as is rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, in comparison with rendering unto God, the things that are God's; but on that account both must not be undervalued, for both are enjoined upon us. Still it is certain that when the less is wanting, the greater has no room and cannot find the ability to practise it.—Behold of brotherly love: 1. The origin. 2. The measure. 3. The power. 4. The growth. 5. The prize and victory.—Only in obedience to the will of God thou growest in the nature of God and art changing from a creature into a child, from a servant into an heir of God.—The glory of love: 1. Whence is it? 2. Where was it manifested? 3. What does it effect? 4. Whither does it lead?—The power of love 1. on earth with reference to the brethren, even to hostile ones; 2. in heaven, in the judgment, before God and Jesus Christ, the Holy One.—The perfecting of love to the brethren is 1. difficult, 2. appointed, 3. sure, 4. glorious.

BERNARD:—God is Love: what then is more precious than love? And he that abides in love, abides in God; what then is more sure than love?

AUGUSTINE:—Thou beholdest the Trinity, when thou beholdest Love, for there are three, he that loveth, he that is loved, and reciprocal love.

LUTHER:—For what shall one say much of it? If one says in a lengthy way, that it is a lofty, noble *qualitas* in the soul and the most precious and perfect of virtues, as the philosophers and work-teachers discourse of it; all this is nothing in comparison with this word which he

pours forth in overflowing eloquence that "*God is Love*," and that His Being and Nature is wholly Love. If any one would paint and produce a likeness of God, he must produce a picture which is wholly love; as if the Divine Nature were nothing else than an oven and fire of love, filling heaven and earth. And again, if Love could be painted and portrayed, it ought to be a picture that is neither real and human, nor angelic and heavenly, but God Himself. See thus the Apostle understands to paint here, that he represents God and Love as identical, in order that by such a noble, precious and lovely picture He may draw and attract us more to Himself and to make us strive to have love among ourselves and to beware of envy, hatred and discord. For as Love is a picture of God, neither a dead picture nor painted on paper, but a living Being of Divine Nature, burning and overflowing with whatever is good, so hatred and envy are a veritable picture of the devil, not human or devilish only, but the devil himself, who is nothing in his nature but an eternal burning of hatred and envy of God and all His works, both man and all creatures; so that that would be the best picture of the devil which would represent all hatred and envy.—As there are also among us still many who hear and teach the Gospel with us, use the same sacraments and affect the manners of genuine Christians; but they are among us like chaff among the wheat; if the battle approaches it becomes manifest whose they are and whither they belong. For there is nothing but pride, vanity, envy, contempt and the devil himself.—It is not a great art to begin a Christian life and love; but it is an art and a task to abide therein and perseveringly to continue therein especially in the presence of temptation and opposition. Although there still are many rough, coarse people that fall off spontaneously like rotten worm-eaten apples or pears, and proceed drowned in their avarice, pride, envy, etc., they are spoiled, useless fruit, wholly unprofitable, that shall and can not remain. But we refer to those who are blown off or struck down by wind and weather, that is, those who suffer themselves to be changed by temptations and thoughts like these: Why should I abide by the doctrine? I well perceive, that it yields no other returns than those of being burdened with the disfavour, contempt, enmity, rage and fury of all the world, that I must risk my body and life, and must ever take the lead against the devil, the world and the flesh, etc. Who can come up to this and persevere, if that is all he is to get?—But it is not to be so; the true course is rather to tear through all opposition, to proceed without heeding obstacles, whether we meet with the sour or the sweet, however it fare with us, be it friend or enemy, or the devil himself and ever to think: I have not entered upon this work in order that the people should give, love or reward me; and therefore no desisting from it though I receive the reward of ingratitude, envy and hatred. It (the world) shall not be so ill to me, as to overcome me with its ill: I will the rather, in opposition to it, continue to do good, regardless of thee or any one else, but for the sake of my Lord Christ, even as He did and still doeth.

STARKE:—Have we become partakers of the Divine Nature, if we are heavenly-minded and lead a heavenly life? It is infallible. As much true love, so much resemblance to God. He is a wise teacher who grounds his exhortations more on the Gospel than on the Law. The power and efficacy of encouragements are in proportion to their friendliness and lovingness.—You say much concerning God, but lack the best thing. You know Him in words, but deny Him in works. You do not know Him at all and will not be known of Him.—In order that one, provoked to anger, may not be overcome by the temptation and succumb, he should forthwith remember that "God is Love." That will be a good medicine to him and preserve him.—None can attain the life of glory without having first experienced here on earth the life of grace in Christ.—Holy Scripture does not expatiate in multiplied phrases which mean the same thing; but what it does repeat, is peculiarly emphatic, and intended to be carefully remembered.—Nothing can be more sweet, agreeable and delightful to us poor men in the vale of misery of this world, than to hear and to receive the assurance that God loves us. The love of God is the cause and rule of our love.—Love is not the cause of our union with God, but it assures, cements, confirms, and preserves it.—Beloved, though sometimes you do not feel any thing of the grace of the union of God and your heart, if you love cordially and abide in love, you have sufficient evidence that you are nevertheless united with God.—None is able to commend love to others with a good conscience, joyfulness and success, who does not himself walk in love. Preachers, more especially, ought to remember that when they exhort others to love, they themselves should copy the example of Christ and practise love.—God is willing, if we do not hinder Him, to make His love more full and to increase its efficacy; and then all the powers of the inner man do also grow in us, and among their number, the love of our neighbour.—Of what avail are the best testimonials if conscience contradicts them? A heart, full of love, is the best witness of friendship with God that endures also in the fire of temptation.—Thou art pleased when a loved friend comes to see thee, and is thy guest for a few days. Rejoice! God, thy best friend, dwells in thee, abides with thee, and possesses thee altogether, but thou art His property and possession. With God thou hast all things.—The love of God manifested in Jesus Christ, is the most excellent object of our faith and knowledge. The more we study it, the greater is our taste of its sweetness.—A glorious mark of the Christian religion as the only Divine religion, viz.: it effects so great a union between man and God, that God is in man and man in God.—O, wicked man, how canst thou be joyful in anticipation of the judgment-day? Beware that thou do deceive thyself with a false security instead of joyfulness!—Good Christian, whenever thou art about to do or to omit a thing, ask thyself: did my Saviour also do or omit this? It will be of great benefit to thee and happily further thee in thy Christian course.—Be not afraid if thou art summoned before an earthly court of justice; if thou lookest joyfully forward to the great judgment of the world, why shouldest thou not be equally joyful in respect of a little

human judgment day? Wherever a Christian may be, he should always suffer himself to be seen without fear or dismay. [Verse of old German hymn.—M.].

A. H. FRANCKE:—One droplet of faith is more glorious than a whole ocean of science, even though it be the historical science of the Divine word.

HEUBNER:—Love has illuminating power, while hatred darkens the soul. The more you love, the greater the brightness of your knowledge; the more you love, the less it is possible for you to be deceived.—Want of love is a token of want of real knowledge of God. All knowledge, all theology must be rooted in love. Theology without the love of God is deception and show. What dry metaphysics have often been called religion and philosophy of religion, without containing a breath of love!—God who is Love can only be known *e praxi, ex usu;* as long as I have not made *personal* experience of the infinite Love of God, I can at the most only repeat what others say of God. Lauding the love of God from what is seen of Him in nature, is not the shadow of the love of God in Christ.—Proud philosophy could assert virtue and morality without the love of God and even go as far as to maintain that virtue without religion is even stronger and purer [than virtue with religion—M.].—Want of love to God is the most telling proof of the fall. For in the *statu integro* our first sign of life ought to be love to God, even as a babe is naturally drawn to its mother's breast. It is true that our love to God proceeds from a sense of shame, from conviction [of sin and ingratitude—M.]; but that cannot now be altered: and he that would deny it ought first to turn the whole world round. And who will most readily own it? They who have *begun* to love God: they are painfully aware how little they love God!—If there had been no apostasy, no breach, what necessity would there be for reconciliation? If reconciliation could have been effected without the Son, by our own efforts, by our own improvement and amending, what purpose would have been served by the sending of the Son?—This is the miracle of love in God, that He kept immovable in His Love and continued to love His creature now as ever, sought the creature although the creature had rebelled in enmity against Him. The love of God, therefore is eternal, unchangeable and having its cause in Himself, without having ever been greater or less than it is. This miracle of love no man can know before he has become aware of his misery, has had his eyes opened and seen with tearful eyes how loving the Lord is.—God has loved *us;* He has also deemed my neighbour worthy of His love: if *God* loves him, am I to refuse loving him? A knowledge of the love of God that has remained unfruitful, is not yet perfected.—There is sympathy or antipathy between the plants of God's planting and of those of his enemy's planting. The children of God are sensible of the spirit of affinity or antipathy in others. So it is said of Coccejus, who beyond all other things strove after a pure heart, that he frequently knew men at the first encounter.—He that underrates historical evidence, overthrows the whole foundation of Christianity and opens the gate and the door to all deception and delusion. Historical knowledge and personal spiritual life-experience *together* constitute true Christianity. God is through and through Love, His whole Essence, His real Nature is Love, *i. e.* is essentially His property to communicate Himself, to impart Himself, to cause His glory and felicity to stream forth on others [*i. e.* His creatures—M.], as it is the essential property of the sun to shine. It is true that the love of God, like the heat of the sun, manifests itself to men only by way of gradation. God is Love to all who stand in love and turn to His Love, but He is a consuming fire to those who stand outside of love. Love spurned brings torment: evil men, because of their own guilt, experience a sense of wrath. Every thing depends upon the attitude of men towards God.—The *Bible* is, as it were, the trumpet of the love of God, not *nature*, by a long way; it is only to *believing* Christians that nature becomes the trumpet of the love of God. The first tones of the love of God may be heard in Gen. i. and iii.; but they sound loudest in the New Testament.—Man is not lost as long as he believes in love; but he is lost, when he loses that belief. Chrysostom says that the devil would be saved if he could believe in the love of God.—Love changes God the Judge into God the Father.—He that cannot confide in love, is unable to endure the look of the Most Loving. Who but those who have pure and indefatigable love are in this world like God and representatives of God?—Where we experience fear, a secret dread, aversion to and distrust of God, love is not yet perfected; fear is the first discipline of boys.—v. 19. The whole wonderful structure of the Christian system; the one half is morality: to love God with every thing implied therein; the other half the doctrine of faith, the conditioning ground: the love of God to us sinners in Christ. The ground must be before the superstructure.—Love is most touching where it prevents the unworthy.—We can only exhibit our love to God the Unseen in His children that are seen.—Christianity indissolubly unites the love of God and the love of the brethren; its characteristic is that in it religion and virtue commingle in the Spirit of love.

GEROK (1 Jno. iv. 7–12): *Love the fundamental law of the world:* 1. As written *in heaven:* for God is Love. 2. As written *on the cross:* for Christ is Love. 3. As written in *our hearts:* for Christianity is Love.

LEONHARDI (1 Jno. iv. 9): *The manifestation of the love of God to us in holy Christmas.* It shines forth: 1. *from the Divine Christmas-gift*, and 2. *from its blessed destination for us.* It was manifested 1. in God sending *His only-begotten Son* into the world, 2. *in that we should live through Him.*

CLAUSS:—*The sending of Christ is the greatest proof of Divine Love.* 1. Christ is the *Only Begotten.* 2. He brings *life to the world.*

The same (on 1 Jno. iv. 12-16):—*The mystery of the Divine Essence.* 1. In which sense does It always remain concealed? 2. In what form has It been revealed? 3. With what eye only are we able to recognize It?

WILHELM:—*The Church of the Lord.* 1. The *good* it has; 2. The *confession* it makes: the *signs* whereby it is known.

LEONHARDI:—*Whereon is based our Trinity-rejoicing?* 1. We know that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world (vv. 14, 15); we have learned in the Son the love which the Father has in regard to us (vv. 15, 16); we know from our love to one another, that He has given us of His Spirit.

LUTHARDT (1 Jno. iv. 9, Advent-Sermon):—*The love of God in Christ is our life.* I. The love of God; 2. The sending of his Son; 3. Our life.

SPURGEON (1 Jno. iv. 19):—*Real love* viewed 1. as to its origin, 2. as to its maintenance, 3. as to its progress.

AHLFELD (Marriage address on 1 Jno. iv. 19, and Sermon on 1 Jno. iv. 9–16):—*With threefold bonds are we tied to the Triune God.* 1. In *the love among one another* God abides in us; 2. In *the Holy Ghost* we abide in God and God in us; 3. In the *confession of the Son of God,* God abides in us and we in God.

On the Epistle for the first Sunday after Trinity, 1 Jno. iv. 16–21.

HEUBNER:—*The belief, that God is Love, our only consolation in evil times.* 1. Why is it thus? 2. How do we become capable of this consolation? *The Divine nature of love.* 1. Proof (vv. 16–18); 2. Inferences (vv. 19–21).—*God is Love.*—1. Explanation. 2. Proof (also Defence); 3. Duties, arising therefrom, incumbent upon us.—*Belief in the love of God.* 1. Description of what it is, and whereon it is founded; 2. The power of this belief; 3. Inferences (resistance to attacks on that belief; its animation by the imitation of Christ).

C. J. NITZSCH (1813 during the siege of Wittenberg, inaugural Sermon on the Epistle for 1st Sunday after Trinity, 1 Jno. iv. 16–21):—*The value of true love under the fear of exciting prospects of the future.* Love exalts us above the whole of our earthly future. Her pains are deep, her complainings sincere; yes, she looks so much the more sadly out into the future, because she can never suffer for herself alone, but true love can nevermore cease to confide or despair of deliverance. To all true love is accorded the privilege of overcoming the world and to soar beyond time in the strength of true faith. She casts the brightest looks into the shadow of the future. She is not blind through fear, and knows that every time will have its own salvation, its own footprints of Divine Love, from the ruins of the old there will spring up the new and the better, in the school of distress there will mature and prosper a nobler liberty and wisdom of the nations, our children and the grandchildren of our race in a rejuvenated world will think with emotion and edification of their fathers, and we ourselves shall never fall short of the assistance and comfort which we need in our weakness. And bright-eyed love has also an indefatigable arm; it makes the best provision for whatever may be in store.

SCHLEIERMACHER:—*Perfection of love.* 1. The token, indicated by the Apostle, of the perfection of love. 2. That that, whereof he treats, can only be achieved by the perfection of love.

KAPFF:—*God is Love, and love only makes us one with God.*

GEROK:—*Another love sermon.* 1. The eternal fountain of love. 2. The holy duty of love. 3. The true test of love. 4. The blissful happiness of love.

RANKE:—*Life in love is the noblest life!* let that be our *conviction; we will abide in this love!* let that be our resolve; *then God will abide with us,* let that be our blessing.

J. MÜLLER:—*Love, the Essence of the Christian life.* 1. The Christian life *begins* with love to God through Christ; 2. it *develops* into love to our neighbour; 3. it *perfects* itself in the perfection of this twofold love.

HARLESS:—*Who knows and loves the living God who is Love?* 1. He who instead of deifying his own love, knows and loves God in His love-manifestation in Christ; 2. he who, instead of loving God without fear, in his love fears God without torment; 3. he who, instead of calling in such love all the world his brethren, loves every one, but after the manner of God in Christ.

SPITTA:—*The word of the Holy Apostle John concerning love.* 1. A word of doctrine, wherein he teaches us love; 2. A word of exhortation, wherein he exhorts us to practice love.

CLAUS HARMS:—*Let us love God!* Consider 1. The *ground* of the love of God, 2. its power and manifestation *inwardly,* 3. its power and manifestation *outwardly.*

BOBE:—God is love! 1. A confession of gratitude (v. 8); 2. a voice of comfort (vv. 17, 18); 3. a rule of life (vv. 19, 20).

FLOREY:—*The hallowing power of love on the heart of man.* 1. It *unites* the heart of man separated from God (v. 16); 2. it *calms*—the anxious heart (vv. 17, 18); 3. it *warms*—the cold heart (v. 19); 4. it *purifies*—the impure and sinful heart (v. 20); it *animates* and *fructifies*—the dead heart (v. 21).

GENZKEN (Confession-address):—*What do I yet lack of true Christianity?* 1. Its *beginning* is that we know *the love which God has to us.* 2. Its *progress,* that we *abide in this love;* 3. Its *full measure,* that *the experience of its hallowing power* expels *the fear of death and the judgment;* 4. The *test* of all this is *brotherly love.*

[PEARSON:—v. 9. Our belief in Christ, as the eternal Son of God, is necessary to raise us unto a thankful acknowledgment of the infinite love of God, appearing in the sending of His only-begotten Son into the world to die for sinners. This love of God is frequently extolled and admired by the Apostles. See Jno. iii. 16; Rom. viii. 5; viii. 32. If we look upon all this as nothing else but that God should cause a man to be born after another manner than other men, and when he was so born after a peculiar manner, yet a mortal man, should deliver him to die for the sins of the world; I see no such great expression of His love in this way of redemption more than would have appeared, if He had redeemed us in any other way. It is true indeed, that the reparation of lapsed man is no act of absolute necessity in respect of God, but that he hath as freely designed our redemption as our creation: considering the misery from which we are redeemed, and the happiness to which we are invited, we cannot but acknowledge the singular love of God, even in the act of redemption itself; but yet the Apostles have raised that consideration higher, and placed the choicest mark of the love of God in choosing such means, and performing in that manner our reparation, by sending His Only-begotten into the world; by not sparing His own Son, by giving and delivering Him up

to be scourged and crucified for us, and the estimation of this act of God's love must necessarily increase proportionably to the dignity of the Son thus sent into the world; because the more worthy the Person of Christ before He suffered, the greater His condescension unto such a suffering condition; and the nearer His relation to the Father, the greater His love to us, for whose sakes He sent Him to suffer. Wherefore to derogate any way from the Person and Nature of our Saviour before He suffered, is so far to undervalue the love of God, and consequently to come short of that acknowledgment and thanksgiving which is due unto Him for it. If then the sending of Christ into the world were the highest act of the love of God which could be expressed; if we be obliged to a return of thankfulness some way correspondent to such infinite love; if such a return can never be made without a true sense of that infinity, and a sense of that infinity of love cannot consist without an apprehension of an infinite dignity of nature in the Person sent; then it is absolutely necessary to believe, that Christ is so the Only-begotten Son of the Father, as to be of the same substance with Him, of glory equal, of majesty coëternal.—M.].

[BARROW: (on v. 9).—How indeed possibly could God have demonstrated a greater excess of kindness to us, than by thus, for our sake and good, sending His dearest Son out of His bosom into this sordid and servile state, subjecting Him to all the infirmities of our frail nature, exposing Him to the worst inconveniences of our low condition? What expressions can signify, what comparisons can set out, the stupendous vastness of this kindness? If we should imagine that a great prince should put his only son (a son most lovely, and worthily most beloved) into rags, should dismiss him from his court, should yield him up to the hardest slavery, merely to the intent that he hereby might redeem from captivity the meanest and basest of his subjects, how faint a resemblance would this be of that immense goodness, of that incomparable mercy, which in this instance the King of all the world hath declared toward us His poor vassals, His indeed unworthy rebels?—And what greater reason of joy can there be, than such an assurance of His love, on whose love all our good dependeth, in whose love all our felicity consisteth? What can be more delightful than to view the face of our Almighty Lord so graciously smiling upon us?—M.].

[BERNARD, de Nativ. Serm. 1. *Apparuerat ante potentia in rerum creatione, apparebat Sapientia in earum gubernatione; sed benignitas misericordiæ nunc maxime apparuit in humanitate.*

P. LEO M., de Nativ. Serm. 1. *Semper quidem diversis modis, multisque mensuris humano generi bonitas divina consuluit, et plurima providentiæ suæ munera omnibus retro seculis clementer impertiit; sed in novissimis temporibus omnem abundantiam solitæ benignitatis excessit; quando in Christo ipsa ad peccatores misericordia, ipsa ad errantes veritas, ipsa ad mortuos vita descendit, etc.*—M.].

[SECKER: (on v. 18).—For want of cultivating the love of God, the thoughts of Him are dreadful to the generality of men. Too many are tempted to wish in their hearts, if they durst, that He were not, or had no regard to human conduct; and if any of them can but persuade themselves for a while on the strength of some poor cavil, to hope what they wish, they triumph in the imagined discovery, that sets them so much at ease. From the same default, humbler and righter minds consider Him very often in no better light, than as a rigid lawgiver arbitrarily exacting a number of almost impracticable duties, and enforcing them with the dread of insupportable punishments: whence they are ready to sink under the terrors of religion, even while they are conscientiously fulfilling its precepts. Looking on God as the object of love would rectify these mistaken conceptions entirely. We should all see and feel, that a Being of infinite goodness, directed by infinite wisdom, is the highest blessing: and the want of such an one would be the greatest calamity that is possible: we should be satisfied that the strictest of His laws, and the severest of their sanctions, are means which He knows to be needful for our good; that His mercy will forgive on repentance our past transgressions of them; that His grace will strengthen us to keep them better; and that He will never reject a soul affectionately devoted to Him. In proportion then as we are so, all terrifying apprehensions will vanish from us. "There is no fear in love" saith the Apostle; "but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment."—M.].

[JORTIN:—The love of God differs so much from the love of sensible objects, and from our other passions, that it can hardly be called a passion in the same sense in which they are so called. It differs in this, that it is at first raised, and afterwards kept up, by reason. It is therefore a religious habit and virtue, which no other passion is, unless it hath God and morality and religion for its objects. In this also it differs from them, that being both produced and preserved by reason, it is a sober and moderate affection, accompanied with no blind impetuosity, no restless uneasiness, no violent commotion of mind, like other passions; and as it riseth not to the same height with them, so neither does it sink as low at other times, but shews itself in an uniform and sedate love of righteousness, of every thing that God approves. Some persons, not duly considering this, sincerely desire to please God, and carefully endeavour to lead a good life; and yet sometimes are afraid that they have no love for God, because they experience not in themselves that warmth of affection, to which others pretend, and which is expressed and required in some books of devotion. They may learn from the Scriptures, that where there is obedience there is always love; and that whoever delights in holiness, and justice, and goodness, and mercy, and truth, may reasonably conclude that his heart is right towards God. Others looking upon the love of God as upon a mere passion, a disposition of mind producing devotion and ending there, have excited in themselves a high zeal and affection for God, and a firm persuasion, that they were His favourites: and, having done this, have thought themselves arrived at Christian perfection; whilst at the same time they have perhaps been under the dominion of evil habits, and addicted to wrath, malice, covetousness, censoriousness, injustice, pride, ambition, sensuality. This strange mix-

ture of hypocrisy, vice and enthusiasm, hath been common in all ages, and ever will be so. There are always those, whose religion and devotion is, to use the words of St. Paul, "sounding brass," or clamour and confidence; whilst true goodness is modest and unaffected, and teaches men to make less noise, to live more honestly. To preserve us from such delusions, Christ hath told us, that we should either keep His commandments, or not pretend to love Him; and that it signifies nothing to say to Him, "Lord, Lord," and not to do what He requires.—Other love towards God than this the Scriptures know not: they never recommend that spiritual fever, those warm transports, and that bold familiarity, which some zealots affect; nor that cold, refined, mysterious, and disinterested devotion, which another sort of fanatics require: for, first, the love of God is sober reason, and not blind passion; reverence, and not presumption: secondly, it is gratitude; and we "love Him, because He first loved us."—M.].

[Horne: (on v. 21).—Observe the firm basis on which is forever fixed the morality of the Gospel. How clear in its principles! how powerful in its motives! "We love God, because He first loved us;" "and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins. If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." For "he who loveth Him that begat, loveth Him also that is begotten of Him." The head of the most unlearned cannot but comprehend the meaning of these few words: and the heart of the most learned must feel the force of them. Such is the ground of that charity, which performeth every duty of social life, and fulfilleth the law. To inculcate and produce in us this heavenly disposition, is the end of the Gospel and all its doctrines. It is deduced in Scripture even from those that may seem to be of the most mysterious and speculative nature: the unity of the Divine Persons; the Divinity and the satisfaction of Christ; doctrines, which cannot therefore be denied or degraded, without removing or proportionably lessening the most endearing and affecting incitements to the Christian life. Indeed the happy temper of a Christian is the natural and kindly effect of the great evangelical truths, when treasured up in the mind, and made the subjects of frequent meditation. The ideas of a reconciled God; a Saviour and Intercessor on high; a gracious Spirit, informing our ignorance, purifying our hearts, relieving our necessities, alleviating our cares, and comforting our sorrows: such ideas as these enable us to bridle the appetites of the body, and to calm the emotions of the mind; to bear with patience and cheerfulness the calamities of life: they sweeten the tempers, and harmonize the affections, resolving them all into one, diversified according to the different situation of its proper object; of which grief laments the absence, and fear apprehends the loss; desire pursues it; hope has it in view; anger rises against obstruction, and joy triumphs in possession. Thus religion fixes the heart on its treasure, in faith without wavering, and resignation without reserve: it draws the affections upwards towards heaven, as the sun does the exhalations of the earth, to return in fruitful showers, and bless the world. M.].

[*Sermons and Sermon Themes.*

v. 8. Leland, John, The goodness of God. 4. Serm. Disc. I. p. 225.

Dwight, T., Benevolence of God is proved by the works of creation and providence.—Benevolence of God, as exhibited by revelation.—Theology I. pp. 119, 139.

Scott, T., God is Love. Works, 4, 69.

v. 9. Tillotson, Abp., The love of God to men in the incarnation of Christ. Serm. 6, 8.

vv. 9, 10. Simeon, C., The love of God in giving His Son for us. Works 20, 479.

v. 10. Henry, Phil., Christ is our Propitiation. M. Henry's Works. Appendix, 40.

vv. 10, 11. The unpurchased love of God in the redemption of the world by Jesus Christ, a great argument for Christian benevolence.

v. 11. Horne, Bp., Charity recommended on its true motive. Disc. 5, 441.

v. 18. Saurin, La tranquillité qui nait de la parfaite charité. Serm. 6. 483.

vv. 18–21. M'Cheyne, R. M., The perfect love of God to us. Remains, 368.

v. 19. Erskine, R., Preventing love; or God's love the cause of our love to Him. Works, 2, 1.

Wardlaw, R., On the question how far disinterestedness is an essential quality in legitimate love to God. Christian Ethics, 278.

Chalmers, T., Gratitude, not a sordid affection. Works, 8, 222.

v. 20. Howe, John, The love of God and our brother, considered in Seventeen Sermons. Works, 6, 1.

Williams, Isaac, Love the mark of God's children. Serm. 2, 51.

v. 21. Smalridge, Bp., The necessary connection between the love of God and our brother. Sermons 310.

Wilberforce, S., The love of the brethren. Sermons on several occasions. 78.—M.].

8. *The power of faith* (vv. 1–5), *its testimony* (vv. 6–10), *and substance* (vv. 11. 12).

Chapter V. 1–12.

Whosoever[1] believeth that Jesus is the Christ[2] is born of God: and every one that
2 loveth him that begat loveth him also[3] that is begotten of him. By this[4] we know
that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments.[5]
3 For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments
4 are not grievous. For[6] whatsoever[7] is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the
5 victory that overcometh[8] the world, *even* our[9] faith. Who is he[10] that overcometh the
6 world, but[11] he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he that came by
water and blood,[12] *even* Jesus Christ[13]; not by water only, but[14] by water and blood.[15]
7 And it is the Spirit[16] that beareth witness, because the Spirit[17] is truth. For there are
three that bear record[18] in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these
8 three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water,
9 and the blood: and these three agree in one.* If we receive the witness of men, the
witness of God is greater: for[19] this is the witness of God which[20] he *hath* testified of
10 his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness[21] in himself: he that
believeth not God[22] hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that
11 God gave of his Son.[23] And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal
12 life, and this[24] life is in his Son.[25] He that hath the Son[26] hath life; *and* he that
hath not the Son of God hath not life.[27]

Verse 1. [[1] German: "Every one that believeth," and so E. V. in second clause.—M.]
[[2] German: "That Jesus is Christ."—M.]
[3] Καὶ before γεγεννημένον is the reading of A. Sin. (which has τὸ instead of τὸν) and several minusc.
[German: "loveth also Him that is begotten of Him."—M.]

Verse 2. [[4] Ἐν τούτῳ, in this, hereby.—M.]
[5] τηρῶμεν, cannot be considered to be supported by A. which omits the following words αὐτὴ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, so that τηρῶμεν there might come from v. 3, although the omission of said words is more easily accounted for, even if we read τηρῶμεν and not ποιῶμεν (B. and al.) v. 2; but Sin. G. K. al. abundantly sustain the reading in question.

Verse 4. [[6] German: "because" so Alford.—M.]
[[7] πᾶν τὸ; German: "all that;" so Alford.—M.]
[[8] ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον; German: "the victory which *hath* overcome the world;" Alford: "has conquered."—M.]
[9] ἡμῶν; so A. B. G. K. Sin.; ὑμῶν, only in unimportant Codd.

Verse 5. [10] Sin. reads δὲ after τίς, B. K. have δὲ after τίς ἐστιν; others read γὰρ; *e. g.* Syriac; others prefix καὶ, while A. and al. [G. Vulg., Lachm., Tischend., Alf.—M.] have no conjunction at all. [German: "But who is it, that etc."—M.]
[[11] German: "If not he;" Alf. "except he."—M.]

Verse 6. [12] καὶ πνεύματος after αἵματος, though found in A. Sin., several minuscules and versions, is evidently an interpretation, like the still less authentic καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι after ἐν τῷ αἵματι.
[13] The Article ὁ before χριστός found in B., is omitted by A. G. Sin. al.
[[14] German: "not *in* the water only" so Alford.—M.]
[[15] German: "but in the water and in the blood."—M.]
[[16] German: "And the Spirit is it that testifieth."—M.]
[17] The reading χριστὸς, instead of τὸ πνεῦμα before ἡ ἀλήθεια is only very feebly supported. Equally devoid of all firm foundation are several readings in this verse which do not even touch the sense, *e. g.* μόνῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ, ἀλήθεια without the Article.

Verse 7. [[18] German: "For they are three that bear witness;" Alford "For those who bear witness are three." German: "And the three are one." Alford: "And the three concur in one."—M.]

Verse 9. [[19] German: "because."—M.]
[20] ὅτι is the reading of A. B. Sin. al. instead of ἣν, Rec. [K. L. al. German: "because that is the testimony of God, that He hath testified of His Son." Alford: "The testimony of God is this, that He hath borne testimony concerning His Son."—M.]

Verse 10. [21] The addition of τοῦ θεοῦ after μαρτυρίαν in A, is wanting in B. Sin. al.
[22] τῷ θεῷ in B. G. Sin. is more authentic than τῷ υἱῷ of A. and in better agreement with the context.
[[23] German: "He that believeth in the Son of God, hath the testimony in himself; he that believeth not God, hath made Him a liar, because He hath not believed in the testimony, which God hath given concerning His Son." The last clause is more correctly rendered thus: "which God hath testified concerning His Son." The variation "record" in this verse in E. V. should by all means be avoided.—M.]

Verse 11. [24] ἐστιν, generally at the end of the verse; in A. between αὕτη and ἡ ζωή.
[[25] German: "And this is the life in His Son."—M.]

Verse 12. [26] τοῦ θεοῦ after the first τὸν υἱὸν, as Luther reads, is too feebly supported; it is wanting in the best Codd., also in Sin.
[[27] German: "hath not the life."—M.]

* For particulars concerning this passage see *Critical Note* on vv. 7, 8.—M.

CRITICAL NOTE ON VERSES 7 AND 8.

After ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες in v. 7, follows: ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσιν v. 8, καὶ τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ·—Thus Cod. 173, not however in the original Cod. of the 11th century, but only in a copy of it made in the 16th century; Codd. 84 and 162, belonging to the same period, viz. the 15th and 16th centuries, omit the words καὶ οἱ τρεῖς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν, and the Articles before πατὴρ, λόγος and ἅγιον πνεῦμα, which shows the mechanical translation from the Vulgate. Said words are wanting in ALL THE GREEK CODICES, also in the CODEX SINAITICUS, in ALMOST ALL THE ANCIENT VERSIONS, INCLUDING THE LATIN, as late as the 8th century, and since that time they are found in three variations. Notwithstanding the trinitarian controversies, they are not referred to by a SINGLE GREEK FATHER, OR BY ANY OF THE OLDER LATIN CHURCH FATHERS. For the allusions of Tertullian (adv. Prax. 25. *connexus Patris in filio et filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes alterum ex altero;* QUI TRES UNUM SUNT), and of Cyprian (ep. ad Jubaianum: *cum* TRES UNUM sunt) are to Jno. x. 30; xvi. 5; and if the latter says in De Unitate Ecclesiæ p. 79. "*Dicit Dominus: ego et Pater unum sumus;* ET ITERUM *de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto Scriptum est:* ET HI TRES UNUM SUNT, the reference in *iterum* is clearly to this place, but to v. 8, to wit, according to the symbolical interpretation [of the words τὸ πνεῦμα, τὸ ὕδωρ and τὸ αἷμα of the Trinity, as given in the Schol. by Matthæi: οἱ τρεῖς δὲ εἶπεν ἀρσενικῶς, ὅτι σύμβολα ταῦτα τῆς τριάδος, and in the Schol.: τουτέστι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ, and on ἕν εἰσιν: τουτέστι μία θεότης, εἷς θεός], as Facundus of Hermiane in the 6th century understood Cyprian, in *Pro defens. trium capitum* 1, 3 [*tres sunt qui testimonium dant (in terra?). Spiritus, aqua et sanguis, hi tres unum sunt .... quod Joannis apostoli testimonium Cyprianus .... de Patre, Filio et Spiritu Sancto intelligit.*—M.], who was not unacquainted with and free from mystical interpretations (the seamless coat, a type of Church unity, etc.). The aforecited Greek scholia contain unmistakable traces of the allegorical interpretation. The reading may gradually have originated in them and the passages from Cyprian, whose interpretation of the Persons of the Trinity was placed in *juxtaposition* with the text on which it was based. These words were mentioned first in a work which is to be ascribed to Vigilius of Thapsus, at the close of the 5th century; they occur more frequently afterwards and are found in most *Latin translations* [also in several German translations made from the Vulgate—M.]. After a Greek translation of the transactions of the Lateran Council of 1215 they were first inserted in Greek in the Complutensian edition (of 1502 to 1514). Erasmus, who did not insert them in his editions of the Greek New Testament of 1516 and 1518, received them in the version of 1521, and the third edition of 1522, yielding to the pressure of the Church (*pium est, nostrum sensum semper ecclesiæ judicio submittere*), and with reference to the Codex Britannicus (=codex 34), in order to justify himself before the learned. [Erasmus had committed himself to their insertion if they were found in any Greek Manuscript. Learning that they were found in said Codex Britannicus, he inserted them in the 3rd edition of 1522 and added the note: "*Ex hoc igitur Codice Britannico reposuimus, quod in nostris dicebatur deesse: ne cui sit ansa calumniandi. Tametsi suspicor codicem illum ad nostros esse correctum.*"—M.]. Then Robert Stephanus received them 1546–1569, Beza 1565–1576 and the Text. Recept. sanctioned the citizenship of this reading. Luther never translated these words, but commented upon them in his second commentary on this Epistle, although he had pronounced them spurious in his first commentary. They are omitted in all German *Wittenberg* Bibles from 1522–1545; they are first inserted in Lehmann's Quarto Wittenberg edition of 1596, although they are still wanting in later editions and in the Quarto edition of 1620. They appear first in the *Zürich* edition of 1529; the next edition of 1531 has this passage in smaller type, the later editions insert it in brackets, which were not abandoned until 1597. The *Basle* edition of 1552 gives it already without brackets. Of the *Frankfort* editions, the Quarto of 1582 was the first in which this passage is inserted, although it is omitted in the Octavo edition of the same year. It was of no avail that Luther considered these words as a clumsy addition directed against the Arians which was wanting in the Greek Bibles, and that Bugenhagen, on the appearance in 1549, of a lectionary, containing these words, at Wittenberg, gave this warning: "*Obsecro chalcographos et eruditos viros, ut illam additionem omittant et restituant græca suæ priori integritati et puritati propter veritatem.*"—The genuineness of this passage was still attempted to be defended in the 17th century. Lastly Bengel still upheld it [but with the arbitrary assumption, that the text read originally thus: "ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ. Τὸ πνεῦμα κ. τ. λ. εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν. v. 8. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ λόγος καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσιν. Apparat. Crit.—M.], who was followed by v. Meyer, Sander, Besser and Mayer.—Compare Griesbach's *diatribe ad h. l. in ed. a.* 1806; Rickli on this passage; Tischendorf *editio major* 1859, *tom.* 2. p. 225–228.—This critical, external evidence is fully sustained by internal evidence, viz. the exegetical reasons against these words. The idea of a witness ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ cannot be carried out. Hence certain commentators, *e. g.* a Lapide, change the *testari in cœlo* into a *testari de cœlo*, or find in it a description of the nature of the testimony (S. Schmidt, Spener), or of the witnesses (Bengel). *Moreover* the collocation of the words ὁ πατὴρ and ὁ λόγος is altogether contrary to John's diction, which gives only ὁ θεὸς and ὁ λόγος or ὁ πατὴρ and ὁ υἱός in juxtaposition (Jno. i. 1 sqq.; v. 21 sqq.; xiv. 9 sqq.) *Again* τὸ ἕν can only be interpreted of unity of essence and the context affords no ground for such an interpretation. The advocates of the passage have *also* recourse to arbitrary expedients, *e. g.* Bengel who places v. 8 before v. 7 [see above—M.]. *Lastly* we cannot consider them to have been inserted by orthodox Christians against the Arians (as Luther thinks), the reference being to a testimony *on earth.* The fact is that they cannot be used without arbitrariness grammati-

cally, dialectically or logically. Cf. Huther 2d edition, p. 228 sq.—[Huther: Luther remarks on this passage: "It seems that this verse was inserted by the orthodox with reference to the Arians, *which insertion however was not congruous*, because he does not discourse of the witnesses in heaven, but of the witnesses on earth, here and there." This is the opinion of most modern expositors, excepting Besser and Sander. If we look at the contents of the *whole* Epistle, it is indeed not difficult to harmonize the thought of the three witnesses in heaven with scattered sayings in this Epistle; but it does not follow from this that it is appropriate or even necessary at the place where it occurs. On the contrary this is manifestly not the case, since neither the verses immediately following or preceding, with which v. 7 is intimately connected by ὅτι, contain any reference whatsoever to such a trinitarian testimony in heaven. The specification of the three witnesses: πνεῦμα, ὕδωρ, αἷμα, is clearly and plainly substantiated by what precedes, but this is not the case with respect to that of the three witnesses: ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον; this trinity is introduced abruptly, without any preparation; but the sequel also militates against it, especially since it is altogether uncertain which testimony is meant by the μαρτυρία του θεοῦ, v. 9, that of the three in heaven, or that of the three on earth.—To this must be added that these two different testimonies are placed in juxtaposition without being connected together; it is said, indeed, that the two three witnesses agree together, but nothing is said of the relation of the two threes to one another.—The thought *per se*, moreover, lacks clearness; for what are we to understand by a testimony in heaven? Bengel (with whom Sander agrees) says indeed: "*Non fertur testimonium in cœlo, sed in terra: qui autem testantur, sunt in terra, sunt in cœlo; i. e. illi sunt naturæ terrestris et humanæ, hi autem naturæ divinæ et gloriosæ.*" But the untenableness of this proposition is evident, on the one hand, from the circumstance that ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ does not belong to εἰσιν, but to μαρτυροῦντες, that consequently the text absolutely says nothing of a being in heaven, but asserts *a testifying in heaven*, and on the other, from the consideration that the πνεῦμα which is afterwards connected with ὕδωρ and αἷμα is to be conceived as something earthly and human.—Add to this the non-johannean character of the diction, for though in John we meet the collocations ὁ θεός and ὁ λόγος, and ὁ πατήρ and ὁ υἱός, we never encounter that of ὁ πατήρ and ὁ λόγος; Sander, to be sure, has recourse to the rather easy expedient of assuming here an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, but that assumption cannot be admitted here, because those words are of constant occurrence in John—and the collocation is not accidental, but founded on the nature of the case. The interpolator evidently wrote λόγος because he thought that term to be purely Johannean, not reflecting however that its connection with πατήρ was un-johannean. Lastly, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι, is also surprising. Bengel explains: *Unum sunt essentia, notitia, voluntate, atque adeo consensu testimonii;* and properly begins with the *unity of essence*, for that is indicated by said words—but this unity of essence is irrelevant here, where the reference is rather to the *unity of the testimony*.—I subjoin here also Sir Isaac Newton's PARAPHRASTIC EXPOSITION: "*Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that* JESUS *is the Son of God*, that Son spoken of in the Psalms, where He saith, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' *This is He that*, after the Jews had long expected Him, *came*, first in a mortal body, *by* baptism of *water, and* then in an immortal one by shedding His *blood* upon the cross, and rising again from the dead; *not by water only, but by water and blood*, being the Son of God, as well as by His supernatural birth of the Virgin (Luke i. 35). *And it is the Spirit* also, *that* together with the water and the blood, *beareth witness* of the truth of His coming; *because the Spirit is truth*, and so a fit and unexceptionable witness. *For there are three that bear record* of His coming; *the Spirit*, which He promised to send, and which was since sent forth upon us in the form of cloven tongues, and of various gifts; *the* baptism of *water*, wherein God testified, 'this is my beloved Son;' *and* the shedding of His *blood*, accompanied with the resurrection, whereby He became the most faithful martyr or witness of the truth. *And these three*, the Spirit, the baptism, and passion of Christ, *agree* in witnessing *one* and the same thing (namely, that the Son of God is come); and therefore their evidence is strong: for the Law requires but two consenting witnesses, and here we have three, *and if we receive the witness of men, the* threefold *witness of God*, which He bare of His Son, by declaring at His baptism 'This is my beloved Son,' by raising Him from the dead, and by pouring out His Spirit upon us, *is greater;* and therefore ought to be more readily received."—"This," Sir Isaac Newton observes, "is the sense plain and natural, and the argument full and strong; but if you insert the testimony of the three in heaven, you interrupt and spoil it; for the whole design of the Apostle being here to prove to men by witness the truth of Christ's coming, I would ask how the testimony of the 'three in heaven' makes to this purpose? If their testimony be not given to men, how does it prove to them the truth of Christ's coming? If it be (given), how is the testimony in heaven distinguished from that on earth? It is the same Spirit which witnesses in heaven and in earth. If in both cases it witnesses to us men, wherein lies the difference between its witnessing in heaven and its witnessing in earth? If in the first case it does not witness to them to whom does it witness? And to what purpose? And how does its witnessing make to the design of St. John's discourse? Let them make good sense of it who are able. For my part, I can make none. If it be said, that we are not to determine what is Scripture, and what not, by our private judgments, I confess it in places not controverted, but in disputable places, I love to take what I can best understand."—M.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Connection. That which in the *preceding* verses had been repeatedly noticed as a proof of the love of God, the appearing of Jesus Christ (vv. 9, 10, 14, 19), and as the immediate consequence of it, had been indicated as the exhibition of our

life-fellowship with God,—faith, knowledge and confession—(vv. 15, 16), the Apostle places with emphatic prominence at the end of this section with a primary reference to brotherly love (v. 1), then with respect to the love of God and obedience to His commandment (vv. 2, 3), with reference to the victory over the world (v. 4), viz. faith in Jesus the Christ (v. 1*a*), the Son of God (v. 5), who is confirmed as such by God Himself (vv. 6–9), and in His work or gift, eternal life (vv. 10–12). Bengel: "*Concinne Apostolus in hac tractationis parte mentionem amoris ita collocat ut fides tanquam prora et puppis totius tractationis, in extremo spectetur.*"

Efficacy of faith in Christ. vv. 1–5.

VER. 1. **Every one that believeth that Jesus is Christ, is born of God.**—The only limitation of the universality (πᾶς) is believing (πιστεύων) and the object of faith (ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστός); the faith may be weak and imperfect, provided that it be sincere (subjective) and right (objective), and consequently true. This believing involves knowledge, inclination, yielding and trust and genders susceptibility for receiving. It is clear from v. 5 that ὁ χριστὸς refers to the inward nature of Him that has been manifested,=ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, although these ideas are not identical and may occur in juxtaposition (iii. 23): the Divine Sonship makes the Man Jesus the Christ=Saviour. Cf. ch. iv. 15 and ii. 22. The tenses, the Present πιστεύων and the Perfect γεγέννηται denote the regeneration, the birth out of God as the ground, and faith, which is a Divine work (Eph. ii. 8), as the consequence; only a child of God believes in Jesus the Son of God.

And every one that loveth Him that begot him, loveth also him that is begotten of Him.—Πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν is a parallel of πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων, and gives prominence to what was given along with and received in faith. Hence there is no need of an ellipsis to be filled up, like that specified by Huther: "he that is born of God loveth God." The object (γεννήσαντα) is evidently God, and hence ἐξ αὐτοῦ=θεοῦ, and τὸν γεγεννημένον ἐξ αὐτοῦ denotes the believer (v. 2: τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ). *Argumentum ex communi naturæ ordine sumtum* (Calvin), or *a propensione naturali, quæ cernitur in hominibus* (Estius). Cf. Eph. v. 28–30. The reference therefore is not to Christ as maintained by Augustine, Hilary and others. The Present ἀγαπᾷ by the side of ὁ ἀγαπῶν denotes the interconnection of brotherly love and the love of God [i. e. *our* love of our brother and of God—M.], the simultaneousness and duration of the relation of both. The Apostle lays it down as a fact, not as something which he requires; he shall love.

VER. 2. **In this we know, that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep His commandments.**—It is clear that the reference here is to something which every one may and must know from his own experience and not from that of others. Again it is clear that this something is brotherly love, even the love to our brethren, who are τέκνα θεοῦ. Lastly it is clear that the token and sign of it is our love to God and our keeping His commandments. For ὅταν followed by the Indicative ἀγαπῶμεν (Winer, p. 325), is a conditional particle, although it is qualified by the idea of time, =whensoever; there may be fluctuations, disturbances, pauses, or ebbs in our love to God; but when it is in us, brotherly love surely is also in us. Hence John annexes to ἀγαπῶμεν τὸν θεόν, τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν in order to designate the living love to God by an obedience rooted in the love of God, so that brotherly love should be considered as one of the commandments of God, and, at the same time, as the necessary consequence of our love to God, as of the necessary ground. [Huther: He that loves God, has in this his love a testimony that he also loves his brethren, even as τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ—because brotherly love is the *necessary consequence* of the love of God; but the converse is also true, that he who loves the brethren, has in this his love a testimony that he also loves God, because his love to God is the *necessary ground* of his love to the brethren. Alford: And indeed so inseparable are the two, that as before iv. 20, our love to our brethren was made a sign and necessary condition of our love to God, so conversely, our love to God, ascertained by our keeping His commandments, is itself the measure of our love to the children of God. Either of the two being found to be present, the presence of the other follows.—M.]. While John elsewhere (ch. ii. 3; iv. 20, 21) makes the knowledge of God and love to God to be ascertained from our keeping His commandments and loving our brethren, *i. e.* the ground from the consequence, so he conversely makes us ascertain the consequence from the ground, which, considering the unity of the Divine life, is the less surprising, since the former references point to the truth and purity of our disposition, while here the concluding reference is to the consolation which we need in the discharge of an important and difficult duty. Hence it is wrong and unnecessary, to assume here, with Grotius following Oecumenius, a trajection, or to construe, with de Wette, the sentence τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν as simply accompanying the sentence immediately following, so that obedience is to be considered only as emanating from the love to God, or still worse, to alter the text, as some of the ancient versions (the Ethiopic and Arabic), and several unimportant expositors, have dared to do. [Calvin also gives a wrong turn to the thought in the remark: "*Nunc docet, recte et ordine amari homines, quum Deus priores obtinet; vult sic mutuam coli inter nos caritatem, ut Deus, præferatur.*"—M.].

VER. 3. **For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments.**—The connection of our love to God with our keeping His commandments doubtless occasioned this saying, in order to take in its unity that which had been treated as simply coördinate [viz. the ideas expressed in the two preceding clauses.—M.]. Huther.—Αὕτη—ἵνα, as in ch. i. 9; iv. 17, denotes the requirement and tendency of love; ἐστιν describes its nature, not=it implies, it includes the effort (de Wette). The context (v. 2) shows that the love of God here is our love to God.

And His commandments are not grievous; this clause is added by John "encouragingly in the full and joyous consciousness of his Divine sonship," (Düsterdieck). Cf. Matth. xi. 30: φορτίον ἐλαφρόν; Luke xi. 46; φορτία δυσβάσ-

τακτα. The connection requires us to apply this only to regenerate Christians, to whom is given the ability to keep the commandments of God. So most Commentators. Cf. *Doctrinal and Ethical* on this section below. [Oxford Catena: εἰ τις προσελθὼν αὐταῖς μὴ ὃν δεῖ τρόπον λέγει αὐτὰς βαρείας, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀσθένειαν ᾐτιάσατο· Φίλον γὰρ τοῖς ἄγαν ἀποβάλλουσιν ἰσχὺν βαρέα νομίζεσθαι καὶ τὰ πανὺ ἐλαφρὰ καὶ κοῦφα.—Spener: "The reference is to the difficulty of a burden so oppressive as to be insupportable and painful."—Calov: "*Dicit ea non esse gravia, quia non aggravant, aut instar molis onerosæ premunt renatum.*"—Huther: "The commandments of God as the requirements of man created after His Image, cannot be difficult to man; but if they are, the reason is, that man has left his original relation to God; they are not difficult to the believer, because, as the child of God, he has returned to the original relation of love to God."—Alford: "This declaration, that His commandments are not grievous, has, as did ch. iii. 9, furnished some of the Roman Catholic Commentators with an opportunity of characterizing very severely the Protestant position that none can keep God's commandments. But here as there the reply is obvious and easy. The course of the Apostle's argument here, as introduced in the next verse by ὅτι, substantiates this βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν by showing that all who are born of God are standing in and upon the victory which their faith has obtained over the world. In this victorious state, and in as far as they have advanced into it, in other words in proportion as the Divine life is developed and dominant in them, do they find those commandments not grievous. If this state, in its ideality, were realized in them, there would be no difficulty for them in God's commandments; it is because, and in so far as sin is still reigning in their mortal bodies and their wills are unsubdued to God's will, that any βάρος remains in keeping those commandments." The reader is also reminded of Augustine's saying, "*Da quod jubes et jube quod vis*" (Confess. 10, 29), and referred to Ausonius (ad. Theodos. 13), "*Juvat qui Jubet,*" and Bp. Sanderson, Serm 3. p. 316.—M.].

VER. 4. **Because all that is born of God overcometh the world.**—Now follows (ὅτι) the reason why the commandments of God are not grievous. Hence πᾶν τὸ γεγεννημένον as in Jno. iii. 6, 37, 39; xvii. 2 (πᾶν—αὐτοῖς, like here πᾶν—ἡμῶν), denotes universality. See notes on ch. i. 1, Winer, p. 191, 5=πάντες οἱ γεγεννημένοι. The reference is to *persons*, not to disposition, *virtutes* and *charismata* (Oecumenius, Paulus), or to the dignity of the Divine sonship (Baumgarten-Crusius).—Κόσμος is here taken collectively, as the opposite of the kingdom of God, as whatever opposes its progress, estranged from and hostile to God and the Divine, within and without men (Calvin [*quicquid adversum est Dei spiritui. Ita naturæ nostræ pravitas pars mundi est, omnes concupiscentiæ, omnes Satanæ actus, quicquid denique nos a Deo abstrahit.*—M.], Beza, Spener, Lücke, Düsterdieck, Huther, and al.); hence not merely inwardly the love of the world and of self (de Wette), or outwardly *homines virtute et pietate adversantes*, their *machinationes*, even to the *persecutiones* (Grotius), nor merely *ecclesia judaica et judaismus* (Schöttgen). [Alford: "The argument then is this: The commandments of God are not grievous: for, although in keeping them there is ever a conflict, yet that conflict issues in universal victory: the whole mass of the born of God conquer the world: therefore none of us need contemplate failure, or faint under his struggle as a hard one."—M.].—The Present νικᾷ denotes the constant victory in the conflict to be endured; "the children of God fight with the world only as conquerors" (Düsterdieck), cf. ch. ii. 13, 14; iv. 4. But νικᾶν must not be diluted into "keeping oneself, unseduced" (Baumgarten-Crusius).

And this is the victory which hath overcome the world: our faith.—Αὕτη νίκη refers to πίστις, ἡμῶν is not explained here but in the next verse. Νίκη, being further qualified by νικήσασα, does not denote the action which conquers the world (Ebrard), but *victoria parta*, the fact of the victory, the faith, not the cause of, but the participation in the victory and the reception of the power of continuing, maintaining and consummating the victory. Lorinus: "*Victoria proprie non vincit, sed comparatur vincendo, sed energiam continet ea formula, denotans in quo sita sit vincendi ratio, unde victoria parta.*" Huther: "Faith is here intended to be extolled not as the result of a conflict, but as the combatant who has gained the victory." Hence faith itself is not yet the victory (Baumgarten-Crusius, Neander), nor must the Aorist be explained to former, departed Christians (Socinus). Cf. ch. ii. 13, 14, 23; iv. 4; v. 12.

VER. 5. **But who is it that overcometh the world, if not he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God.**—While v. 4 brought in ἡμῶν πίστις, this verse gives emphatic prominence to the *contents* of the faith qualified by ἡμῶν in a triumphant question well suited to this section of the victory over the world. Bengel: *Credens omnis et solus vincit.* Episcopius: *Lustrate universum mundum et ostendite mihi vel unum, de quo vere affirmari possit, quod mundum vincat, qui christianus et fide hac præditus non sit.* The Apostle, in this question, appeals to the experience of his Church. The Present ὁ νικῶν, which, with respect to the fact: ἡ νίκη νικήσασα (v. 4), denotes the person conquering in the conflict, indicates the existing and present attitude and relation of the believer. But by the variation: ὅτι—ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ instead of ὁ χριστός v. 1, the Apostle refers to the essential glory of Jesus, and also to the fact that believers, as partakers of His glory and as the children of God, of course conquer with Him and participate in His victory. The believer, who is Christ's and whose is Christ the Son of God, is a conqueror in his character of being a child of God. If only faith is true, and the believer born again, born of God, which may be ascertained from love to the brethren and love to God and a hearty obedience to the commandments of God,—the victory over the world also is indubitable. And with this the Apostle is here particularly concerned.

Jesus is really confirmed as the Son of God. vv. 6–9.

VER. 6. **This is He that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ.**—Οὗτος refers to the Person Jesus, whose dignity is proved and confirmed. Ὁ ἐλθών must be taken substantively as at ch. i.

5; Jno. i. 15, 33; iii. 13, 31; the Article requires this and forbids the connection of the Participle with the preceding ἐστιν, as if it were=this one came; for we read not ἐστιν ἐλθὼν, but ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθών. But we must here hold fast the usual form of the *Partic. Aoristi*, which simply narrates that which has happened, and does not denote present events or past events continuing in the present; this would require ἐρχόμενος or ἐληλυθώς (ch. iv. 2). How He came is stated in the words δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, viz. by means of, by water and blood; διά denotes the medium; immediately afterwards we have ἐν ὕδατι, which indicates surrounding or accompaniment. There must therefore be facts, and facts at once historical and external, by which He came, and which are important and efficacious to demonstrate Him, who He is. Moreover the connection of the two requires us to understand acts equal in kind and relation. Hence we must explain δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος of the baptism, which He received of John in Jordan and which by its immersion pointed to death, while the voice of the Father uttered over Him pointed out His filial dignity, and of His death upon the cross with its atoning sacrificial virtue; in both facts He proved His obedience to the will of the Father, while His obedience proved Him to be the Son of God, the Holy and Innocent One.—Now the apposition Ἰησοῦς=οὗτος, χριστὸς=ὁ ελθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, comprises what is here said into one whole as the result. A similar turn may be seen in Rom. i. 3, 4. Consequently we must not, contrary to the grammar and the dialectics of the text, refer οὗτος to the Predicate ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ v. 5 (with Knapp, Huther 1st ed.), but to the Subject (Lücke), or to the Subject qualified by the Predicate (Huther 2d ed.); we must and cannot explain contrary to grammatical usage (Matth. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19 sq.; Jno. xi. 27), ὁ ἐλθών of the Messiah, like ὁ ἐρχόμενος, and connect ἐστιν with δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* ii. 1, p. 469), or take ἐστιν ἐλθὼν as a circumlocution of the *verbum finitum* the Article notwithstanding, and thus overlooking the force of the Aorist, explain it as a Present: He comes (Luther and al.), or as a Perfect: He has come and comes (de Wette, Sander and al.). There is no reference here to the water and blood which flowed from His side pierced on the cross (Jno. xix. 34, Augustine and al.), because the passage in John has αἷμα before ὕδωρ, and because that does not constitute a phase of His life, but is something which, after death had set in, took place in His body, so that concerning it we cannot predicate ὁ ἐλθὼν διά. The symbolical reference of this passage to the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is inadmissible (Luther I, S. Schmid, Bengel, Sander, Besser and al.), since the term ἐληλυθὼς is not used here, and αἷμα is not used to describe the Lord's Supper; but since the two ideas are parallel, ὕδωρ cannot be referred to the Sacrament of Baptism (ὕδωρ moreover cannot be made to designate Baptism Jno. i. 26, 33), as instituted by Christ, nor αἷμα to the death He suffered (de Wette, Rickli, Düsterdieck, Ebrard and al.), nor both together to Baptism only (Luther I), since Baptism was administered into the death of Christ; the *double* reference is, by all means, to be held fast. It is either historically or grammatically unwarranted to explain ὕδωρ of *vita purissima* (Grotius), *doctrina pura* (Socinus), *regeneratio et fides* (Clemens Alex.), of tears, and αἷμα of the blood shed at the circumcision, *expiatio* (Cameron), *redemptio* (Bullinger), *cognitio* (Clemens Alex.). Compare particularly Huther on this passage. [Huther, who has changed his view expressed in the first ed. of his commentary, says in the 2d ed. p. 221. "There are two points in the life of Jesus which answer to the terms ὕδωρ and αἷμα, to wit, *His Baptism* at the *beginning* of His Messianic career, and *His bloody death* at the *end* of the same; by *Baptism* Jesus entered upon His office, which is the office of reconciliation; it constitutes the *initiatio* (Erdmann, Myrberg) of it; this initiation, however, did not take place only by that which occurred during His Baptism, but by the act of the Baptism itself, since thereby Christ consecrated Himself to death, which was symbolized by the act of immersion; by His *death* He effected reconciliation in cancelling with His Blood the debt of the world of sinners, for χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις (Heb. ix. 22). The Apostle therefore rightly designates Christ as the Reconciler, as Him that came δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος. The view that ὕδωρ and αἷμα are to be explained of the Sacraments instituted by Christ is confuted not only by the circumstance that they are only *the means of appropriating* the reconciliation effected by Him, whereas we are here concerned with *the accomplishment of the reconciliation itself*, but also by the use of the Aorist ἐλθών, instead of which in the former case we ought to have the Present, and by the fact that the term αἷμα, used alone, is in the New Testament *not once* applied to the Lord's Supper; in 1 Cor. xii. 13 also ἐποτίσθησαν does not allude to the Lord's Supper, but to the communication of the Spirit in Baptism.—The opinion that though αἷμα denotes the death which Christ suffered, ὕδωρ does not signify the Baptism He received is opposed by the following considerations: 1. The close connection of the two words (διά not being repeated before αἵματος) is only fitting if the ideas correspond the one to the other, which they do not if δι' ὕδατος is referred to an institution of Christ, and αἵματος to the blood shed by Christ. 2. The simple term ὕδωρ is ill-suited to designate Christian baptism (for Christian Baptism is distinguished from John's Baptism in that the former is *essentially* not ὕδωρ like the latter; even as John the Baptist distinguishing himself from Christ said: ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι Jno. i. 26, while Jesus had been indicated to him as ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, Jno. i. 33. 3. Since the institution of Baptism took place *after* the death of Christ and necessarily presupposed that death, John, had he understood by ὕδωρ Christian Baptism, would surely have put ὕδατος not *before* but *after* αἵματος. Hilgenfeld and Neander have justly maintained that if ἔρχεσθαι δι' αἵματος denotes something relating to the Messiah personally, ἔρχεσθαι δι' ὕδατος must do so likewise. The relation must be the same in both terms. If αἷμα signifies the death to which Christ submitted, ὕδωρ also can only signify the Baptism to which He in like manner submitted."—Passing to that class of commentators who substantially admit the views expressed by Huther, but superadd a

secondary or implied sacramental reference, we give the language of Alford who says that "ὕδωρ represents the Baptism of water which the Lord Himself underwent and instituted for His followers, αἷμα, the Baptism of blood which He Himself underwent and instituted for His followers. It is equally impossible to sever . . . . from these words the historical accompaniments and associations which arise on their mention. The Lord's Baptism, of itself, was indeed rather a result than a proof of His Messiahship: but in it, taking St. John's account only, a testimony to His Divine Sonship is given, by which the Baptist knew Him to be the Son of God: ἐγὼ ἑώρακα κ. μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, are his words, Jno. i. 34; and when that blood was poured from His "riven side," he that saw it again uses the same formula ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκε. It cannot be that the word μαρτυρία being thus referred to two definite points of our Lord's life, should not apply to these two, connected as they are with ὕδωρ and αἷμα here mentioned, and associated by St. John Himself with the remarkable preterite μεμαρτύρηκεν, of an abiding μαρτυρία in both cases. But these past facts in the Lord's life are this abiding testimony to us, by virtue of the permanent application to us of their cleansing and atoning power."—Wordsworth, as usual, adopts the Patristic and symbolical interpretation, and as the views of other classes of commentators have been given at considerable length, we add as a *curiosum* his exposition of this passage in a condensed form. "Jesus Christ *came*, as the Messiah and Son of God, in various ways.

1. 'He *came* in all the purifications that were made by *water* and *blood* under the Old Law, which was dedicated with blood and water. Heb. ix. 22; because all those purifications were typical of, and preparatory to, His sacrifice on the Cross, and derived all their efficacy from it. . . . . . .

2. 'He *came* by *water* in His Baptism; and by *blood* in His circumcision, and especially in His agony and bloody sweat in Gethsemane, and by the blood shed in His scourging before His passion, and in the crown of thorns, and the piercing of His hands at the crucifixion. . . . .

3. 'He *came* both by *water and blood* at once, in a special manner, on Calvary after His death. . . .

'Thus St. John in his Gospel prepares us to understand the words of this Epistle; and in his Epistle also he elucidates what had been recorded in his Gospel. His words therefore may be thus paraphrased: 'This is He who *came*—that is, proved Himself to be what He was pre-announced to be by the types and prophecies of the Old Testament, and what He proclaimed Himself to be in the New—the "*Coming One*," "*The Comer*" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος), the *Messiah*, the true *Paschal Lamb*, and *Very Man*, a true *Sacrifice for Sin;* and yet *Very God*, the *Everlasting Jehovah*, of whom the prophet Zechariah spoke (Zech. xii. 10), when he prophesied of His being pierced at His death.

'He came by *blood* and *water*. He proved thereby the reality of His *humanity* and of His *death;* and thus He has given a practical refutation—which St. John saw with his own eyes—to the heretical notions of those in the Apostolical age, such as Simon Magus and the Docetae, who alleged that Christ had *not a real human body*, but was merely a spectral phantasm, crucified in show; and therefore Irenæus in the next age after St. John, infers this fact of the piercing of the side and the flowing out of the blood and water, recorded by St. John, as conclusive against their heresy. . . .

'In the words, "*not* by *water* only," there seems also to be a reference to another heresy of the Apostolic age, that of Cerinthus, who said that Christ came in the *water of baptism*, and descended into the Man Jesus; and afterwards departed from Him, when He shed His *blood* on the cross. In opposition to this notion St. John says, "This is He who came by water and blood; *not by water only*, but by water and *blood*."

4. 'Further it is to be observed that in this passage of his Epistle St. John is speaking of Christ's *generation*, and of our *regeneration*.—Every one who believeth that Jesus is the Christ, *hath been born*, and *is born*, of *God; i. e.*, is *regenerate;* and every one who loveth Him that *begat*, loveth Him also that is *begotten of Him; i. e.*, whosoever loveth God the *Father*, loveth Him who by *generation* is the only-begotten *Son of God;* and every thing that is born of God (*i. e.*, is *regenerate*) overcometh the world; and who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that *Jesus*—the *Very Man* Jesus—is also the *Son of God?*

'St. John then proceeds to describe the *means* by which *our regeneration*, or *New Birth*, is communicated to us from God, through His Son Christ Jesus, Very Man and Very God, and how the *new life*, so communicated, is sustained *in us*. He does this by saying, This is *He who came*—came to us—by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood.

'The *natural* life which was imparted to Eve—the Mother of all living, the type of the Church, the Spouse of the Second Adam, Jesus Christ—was derived from the first Adam's side, opened when he was *asleep* in Paradise. In like manner, the *spiritual life* is given to the spiritual *Eve*, the Church, and to all her faithful members, from the side of the second Adam, Jesus Christ, *sleeping in death* on the cross; and it is communicated through His *death* by means of the *water* and *blood* of the *two sacraments*, which derive their quickening, cleansing and invigorating virtue from the Divinity, Incarnation and Death of our crucified Lord and Saviour, and by which the benefit of that death is applied to our regeneration and revivification; and which were visibly exhibited in the *water* and *blood* flowing from His precious side, pierced on the cross. . . . [See Augustine, Serm. V.—M.].

'He came by water, which is our λουτρὸν, and by blood, which is our λύτρον. His Baptism of blood is our λύτρον, or *ransom* from death; and His Baptism by water is our λουτρὸν, or *laver* of birth. And the *water* of the λουτρὸν derives its efficacy from the *blood* of the λυτρόν, shed on the cross, which works in and by the water of baptism. He has washed us from our sins in His own *blood* (Rev. i. 15). His *blood cleanseth* us from all sin (1 Jno. i. 7). In baptism we pass through the Red Sea of His blood, and are delivered from our enemies thereby."—For further particulars connected with the symbolical interpretation, the reader is referred to Wordsworth

himself, and for a good account of all the interpretations, to Huther's Commentary, 2d edition, pp. 217–219.—M.].

Not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood.—The preposition *ἐν* should be connected with *ἐλθὼν*, and, as compared with *διὰ*, signifying the medium through which, introduces a new shade of thought, viz., the surrounding, accompaniment and sphere [or "element in which"—M.]; a similar change occurs at Heb. ix. 12, 25 (Delitzsch, pp. 390, 431). *Articulus habet vim relativam* (Bengel) to what has just been specified, which must be taken in the same sense as before. *Μόνον* after *ὕδατι* renders the latter very emphatic, and is not followed by *ἀλλὰ καὶ* because it is not connected with *οὐ*. Consequently not only in the Baptism received at the hands of John the Baptist has Jesus been proved to be the Christ, the Son of God, but in both. This refutes the opinion of those heretics who alleged that the Son of God was with Jesus at His Baptism, but not at His death upon the cross, that He left Him before His death (Huther [*i. e.*, the heresy of Cerinthus.—M.]). The distinction of Jesus from the Baptist, who baptized with water only, is out of the question, the reference being not to Jesus' baptizing, but to His being baptized (against Lücke, Düsterdieck, Ebrard and others).

And it is the Spirit that testifieth.—*Καὶ* superadds a further and third particular, an additional witness (*ἐστιν τὸ μαρτυροῦν* cf. *ὁ ἐλθὼν*). The Article before the Participle compels us to understand *τὸ πνεῦμα* as the absolute, objective Spirit, as the Holy Spirit, and the Present denotes the continuance of the office of witnessing (Jno. xv. 26) wherein He leads into all truth, mediates fellowship with Christ, and secures eternal life. *Τὸ πνεῦμα* must not be explained of the spirit of believers, of the spiritual life wrought in believers by the Holy Spirit (Episcopius, Sander and others); this is forbidden by the context, and the grammatical usage of the New Testament disallows such a construction without any further qualification Nor is it=*ὁ πνευματικός*, *i. e.*, the Apostle John himself (Ziegler, Stroth), nor a third sacrament of *absolution* (Augustine), nor the word, the ministry of the word (Luther, Piscator, al.). [In order to complete the catalogue of curious and fantastic views begun in the text, we mention those of Oecumenius and Knapp, who regard *τὸ πνευμᾶ*=*ὁ θεός—διὰ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτε ὡς θεὸς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν· θεοῦ γὰρ τοῦτο μόνου λοιπόν, τὸ ἀνιστᾷν ἑαυτόν. τῇ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος φωνῇ σημαίνεται ὁ θεος*: thus making the threefold witness to the *υἱοθεσία* of Jesus, *τὸ βάπτισμα, ὁ σταυρός, ἡ ἀνάστασις*; of Socinus, Schlichting, Grotius, Whitby and al. who understand the Divine power by which Christ wrought His miracles: '*id est*,' says Grotius, '*per μετωνυμίαν, admiranda ejus opera, a virtute divina manifeste procedentia*,' of Bede, who understands the Spirit which descended on the Lord at His Baptism, and of Wetstein, who considers *τὸ πνεῦμα* to signify the *psychical* element which, along with *ὕδωρ* and *αἷμα* the *physical* elements, constituted the human nature of Christ.—The interpretation given by Braune is that of Scholiast I., Estius, Corn. a-Lapide, Tirinus, Calvin, Calov, Lücke, Rickli, de Wette, Huther, Neander, Düsterdieck, Alford and Wordsworth. It is the *Holy Spirit*, whom Christ in fulfilment of His promise, sent to His Church on the Day of Pentecost, and who is a permanent witness of the Divine Sonship of Jesus.—M.].

Because the Spirit is the truth.—This clause does not contain the substance of the testimony, which is determined by the context (viz., that Jesus, the Son of God, is the Christ), but the reason of the testimony, as being a reliable one; *ὅτι* is=*because*, not=*that* (Luther, Besser, al.). Ἡ *ἀλήθεια* designates the Truth revealed in the word of God, and received in faith, in its perfect fulness, which Truth is the nature of the Spirit who is the Spirit of the Truth into which He leadeth (Jno. xiv. 17; xv. 26; xvi. 13). Christ, who has the Spirit without measure (Jno. iii. 34 sq.), and who with the Father sends Him (Jno. xv. 26; xvi. 7), is of course in the same sense the Truth according to His nature (Jno. iv. 6). We must not construe *ἡ ἀλήθεια*=*ἀληθές*, as Grotius does. [Estius: "*Testimonium ejus haudquaquam rejici potest, quoniam Spiritus est veritas, quam sit Deus, ideoque nec falli potest, nec fallere.*"—M.].

Vv. 7, 8. **For three are the witnesses, Spirit, water and blood.**—[Grotius: "*Johannes hic causam reddit, cur locutus fuerit non de Spiritu tantum, cujus præcipua in hoc negotio est auctoritas, verum etiam de aqua et sanguine, quia in illis etiam non exigua est testimonii fides, et ternarius numerus in testibus est perfectissimus.*"—M.]. This formula is precisely like that of the preceding verse (v. 6). *Οἱ μαρτυροῦντες* of course must be construed substantively and in the same sense as v. 6, nor must be supplied another object of the testimony; in like manner *τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα* bear exactly the same meaning here as in v. 6. The historical facts, previously specified merely as evidencing the Divine Sonship of Jesus, are now introduced in the Masculine Gender, in order to designate them as concrete witnesses, like persons (Lücke and al.); but of course so, that they are subordinated to the Spirit, who is the principal, and alone absolute Witness, employing and making use of the facts in the life of Jesus. The verb denotes the activity of the testifying, with reference to the condition of being *μάρτυρ*, and the Present signifies the permanent character of that activity, wherefore it is not necessary to think here of objects at present existing, *e. g.*, the sacraments, but we have only to hold fast that these facts in the history of the life of Jesus, like that history itself, are fixed in the Gospels, and that these facts, even without such written fixedness, continue to be permanently operative during the years of salvation [*i. e.*, the dispensation of grace.—M.] with world-historical import [*i. e.*, exerting a permanent influence on the world's history during the dispensation of grace. —M.].—*Τρεῖς*, with reference to Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15; Matth. xviii. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 1; Heb. x. 28, 29, denotes the assurance of the perfectness of the testimony. This sentence is annexed with *ὅτι*=for, in order to represent now in a compressed form the testimony, particularized in v. 6, as a weighty confirmation and substantiation of the truth, that Jesus, the Son of God, is the Christ.

And the three are one.—The Article *οἱ τρεῖς* denotes here, as also previously, the witnesses already designated and well known, and

likewise in $\epsilon i\varsigma\ \tau\grave{o}\ \H{\epsilon}\nu$ the one Truth in question, the object of the testimony (ch. v. 1, 5). Εἰς, like εἰς ἓν in Jno. xi. 52; xvii. 23, denotes *in unum consentire.*—Hence we need neither assume with de Wette, an ellipsis between vv. 6 and 7, 8, nor take ὅτι in the sense of *jam vero* (Grotius), *consequently, therefore* (Baumgarten-Crusius, Meyer), nor understand τρεῖς οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, with Bengel, of three different classes of men (*prophetas, baptistas, apostolos*), or of symbols of the Trinity. Lastly we must not interpret the being one, with Luther, as a being together, a being joined together. [Alford renders "and the three concur in one" and explains, that they contribute to one and the same result: viz., the truth that Jesus is the Christ, and that we have life in Him. Wordsworth explains the passage of the Trinity and the sacraments and paraphrases: *these three* (Persons) who are bearing witness *are joined into one* (ἓν one *substance*, neuter). He collects, as usual, many Patristic and Anglican notices and gives in his exegesis the following:—'The *Spirit*, who begins the work of regeneration by applying all quickening grace to man.—The *Water:* the symbol and instrument of the new birth derived from God the Father, who is the original *Well-spring* and *Fountain* of all life and grace to man. The natural heavens and the earth were formed out of the *Water*. There was their origin (2 Pet. iii. 5). So it is with the spiritual life; it is formed from out of water. Water therefore is a proper symbol of the Paternity of God.—The *Blood*, symbolizing the *Incarnation* and *Passion* of *God, the Son through* whom all grace descends *from* the *Father, by* the *Holy Spirit*. 2 Cor. xiii. 13.—These three Persons are joined consubstantially *into one Godhead;* and their *Witness* is *the witness of God.* (Andrews: "*Water* notes *Creation; Blood* notes *Redemption* by Christ; the *Spirit* notes *Unction*, to complete all").—There is an image of the Trinity in the Christian sacraments. There is *baptismus* FLUMINIS, the baptism of *water*, the work of *Creation* by the *Father;* there is *baptismus* SANGUINIS, the baptism of *blood*, the work of Redemption by the *Son;* but these are not enough, unless there be also the *baptismus* FLAMINIS, the Baptism of the *Spirit*. Thus the work of the Ever-Blessed Trinity is done in the soul.' In addition to the notes on the spurious passage given above, the reader is referred to a sketch on this subject in Horne's Introduction, vol. IV. pp. 355-388.—M].

VER. 9. **If we receive the testimony of men.**—Εἰ denotes an undoubted fact; hence the Indicative, but the fact is put down as the premise of a conclusion. [It is an *argumentum a minori ad majus.*—M.]. Winer p. 307 sq. [also *ibid*, p. 642.—M.]. In τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. the Article opposes the human testimony to the Divine, without in any way specifying one qualified by its substance (Brückner). The reference therefore is neither to the prophecy of Christ (Bede), nor to John the Baptist, to eye- and ear-witnesses (Wetstein, Stier), nor to prophets, baptists and Apostles (Bengel). Grotius takes λαμβάνειν=*judicio approbare*, and Düsterdieck understands any human testimony, provided that it possess the necessary requirements.

The testimony of God is greater.—Here ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ is not particular, but quite general [The particular is specified in the sequel. Supply in the argument: much more must we receive the testimony of God (Winer).—M.]. As the testimony of God it is greater than that of men and requires so much the more its reception and validity.

Because this is the testimony of God. Now follows the definite testimony of God, which must be received as the testimony of God. Here is evidently an ellipsis, viz.: but a Divine testimony is really extant, namely this . . . . (Düsterdieck).

That He hath testified of His Son.—The clause beginning with ὅτι depends on αὕτη, and notes the testimony as a historical fact, μεμαρτύρηκε, which has been given, but must be understood to be continuous and permanent in its operation, namely the threefold testimony specified in vv. 7, 8. Hence ὅτι cannot be rendered "because," which would especially designate the author of the testimony, in which case αὐτὸς could hardly be wanting before μεμαρτύρηκε; nor is here any reference to internal testimony (Düsterdieck) introduced afterwards, and still less to the testimony vouchsafed to John the Baptist (Jno. i. 33), as maintained by Ebrard.

The possession of eternal life in the faith on Jesus the Son of God, is the inward confirmation of the Divine testimony vv. 10-12.

VER. 10. **He that believeth in the Son of God, hath the testimony in himself.** —The result as well as the purport of the Divine testimony is faith in Jesus as the Son of God; hence we now have ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. Such an one ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ. The addition τοῦ θεοῦ is unnecessary; the context precludes any other testimony than that of God; the Article designates that which has been specified and is known. "The outward has become to him something inward" (Huther). ["The object of the Divine testimony being, to produce faith in Christ, the Apostle takes him in whom it has wrought this its effect, one who habitually believes in the Son of God, and says of such an one, that he possesses the testimony in himself. What it is, he does not plainly say till below, v. 11. But easily enough here we can synthetically put together and conjecture of what testimony it is that he is speaking: the Spirit by whom we are born again to eternal Life, the water of baptism by which the new birth is brought to pass in us by the power of the Holy Ghost (Jno. iii. 5; Tit. iii. 5), the Blood of Jesus, by which we have reconciliation with God, and purification from our sins (ch. i. 7; ii. 2), and eternal life (Jno. vi. 53 sqq.),—these three all contribute to and make up our faith in Christ, and so compose that testimony, which the Apostle designates in v. 11 by the shorter term which comprehends them all." Alford following Düsterdieck.—M.].—Ἔχειν bears the same sense here as in. v. 12; ch. iii. 3; ii. 28. Ἐν ἑαυτῷ might be wanting, but John specifies besides the having, the possession of the sphere, the believer's own inward testimony for it. It is wrong to render, *to have with him* (Luther), more wrong, *recipit in se* (Grotius), nor is it=τηρεῖ (Baumgarten-Crusius), nor=he *not only receives it, but is also firmly convinced of it* (Lücke), nor=*he has*

received it in and with himself (de Wette).—As usual, the Apostle continues in the negative.

He that believeth not God, hath made Him a liar.—The Dative refers not to the object of faith, but to the witness; hence the reading τῷ υἱῷ is not in agreement with the text, as is τῷ θεῷ τῷ μεμαρτυρηκότι (Huther); this is confirmed by αὐτὸν, which must be referred to God, but would have to be connected with υἱῷ, if that were the reading. The Perfect πεποίηκεν indicates the still continuing and operating animus of the disbeliever: he has told and ever tells God to the face: thou liest (Luther). The reason follows:

Because he hath not believed in the testimony, which God hath given concerning His Son.—Οὐ πεπίστευκεν and not μή, because John refers to him, whom he had supposed not to believe (ὁ μὴ πιστεύων), as a definite individual, who in point of fact, objectively, has not become believing. Jno. iii. 18: ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν, because there the reference is to the judgment of the judge, and not simply to a fact *per se*. See Winer, p. 495 sq. The Perfects denote continuing and permanent facts.

Ver. 11. **And the testimony is this, that God hath given us** [better *gave us*—M.] **eternal life.**—John now annexes by καί what follows, and this is the substance, the testimony consists in this (αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία); the reference is not to *intentio, finis* of the same (Lyra), nor to its use, fruit and blessing (Calov, Spener), nor to its exhibition, test, experience (Lücke, Neander, Huther). The testimony of God is in himself eternal life, which at the Baptism of Jesus, at His death, in the Holy Spirit, makes itself felt and perceptible, and testifies for the Son of God. Hence ὅτι=that, and ἔδωκεν, like μεμαρτύρηκεν points to a giving, with a present continuing of that past giving; it cannot be *dare decrevit, promisit* (Socinus, Carpzov), any more than ζωὴ αἰώνιος is *vita æterna in spe* (Bede), to be given only in heaven *in re*. Ἡμῖν designates the οἱ πεπιστευκότες. To the principal idea, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, placed first, the Apostle now adds

And that is the life in His Son, (or: *and this life is in His Son*).—This clause is co-ordinate with the one preceding and not dependent on ὅτι. Αὕτη ἡ ζωή is ἡ αἰώνιος, and this is in Jesus the Son of God; ἐν is not *per* (Grotius), or in communion with Him, nor ἐστιν=*contingit*. The eternal life is οὐσιωδῶς (Jno. i. 4; xi. 25; xiv. 6), σωματικῶς (Col. ii. 9), ἐνεργητικῶς (2 Tim. i. 10) in Christ. It became manifest in Him, because it really was in Him, and the believer participates in the eternal life, because he has part in the Son of God. Hence the conclusion.

Ver. 12. **He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God, hath not the life** (or: *the life he hath not*).—Very fine and pointed is Bengel's note: "Habet versus duo cola; in priore non additur *Dei*, nam fideles norunt *Filium;* in altero additur, ut demum sciant infideles, quanti sit, non habere. Priore hemistichio cum emphasi pronunciandum est *habet;* in altero *vitam.*" This is also indicated by the arrangement of the words (Düsterdieck). Ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν is not=*habet jus certum ad vitam æternam* (Grotius). Cf. i. 3: ii. 23; Jno. xvii. 3. [Alford: "*The having the Son* is the possession of Christ by faith testified by the Spirit, the water and the blood: and the *having the life* is the actually possessing it, not indeed in its most glorious development, but in all its reality and vitality."—M.]. Ὁ μὴ ἔχων points to a supposition: if one has not; which implies that he might have, but only through faith vv. 10, 11. [Düsterdieck has remarked that the use of ὁ μὴ ἔχων, not ὁ οὐκ ἔχων (cf. οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, 1 Pet. ii. 10) shows that the Apostle is contemplating, at all events primarily, rather a possible contingency than an actual fact: and thus is, primarily again, confirming his saying to those to whom the Divine testimony has come. To them, according as they receive or do not receive it, according as they are οἱ ἔχοντες or οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, it is a savour of life unto life, or of death unto death."—M.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. Concerning the Person of Christ.

1. In Christ, as the Son of God is the life eternal, so that it is as well said: God has given us the eternal life (v. 11), as: He gave His only begotten Son (Jno. iii. 16); and he that hath the Son, hath the life, the eternal (v. 11). Beside Him there is no salvation (Acts iv. 12).

2. The essential nature of the Son was unmistakably exhibited in His obedience to the will of the Father, both at the commencement of His ministry by the baptism in Jordan, and at the close of it in His death upon the cross (v. 6).

3. The testimony of the Holy Spirit for the Divine Sonship of Christ must not be separated from the historical facts of His life, even as these cannot become witnesses without the Holy Spirit, who has the office of testifying (vv. 6–8); the history on earth must not be severed from the Spirit of God. One might almost find here the principle of the Lutheran Church that the *finitum* may become *infiniti capax*, in opposition to the [German] Reformed principle: *finitum infiniti non capax*.

4. The Father hath so definitely appointed all things, that He who does not believe in the Divine Sonship of Jesus, refuses to believe God (v. 10), as in Jno. xiv. 1.

II. Concerning the acquisition of salvation.

1. *The origin of faith*: *Regeneratio præcedit fidem* (v. 1).

2. *The nature of faith:* it is essentially an ethical act laying hold of the merit of Christ, of the love of the Father in the Son, so that it has (ἔχει) that on which it believes (vv. 12, 10, 11): it includes therefore love, and is not to be joined only to it, as set forth in the Roman Catholic representation of the *fides formata*. Nor does John allow faith to be described as the second condition, nor even as the first condition by the side of love and morality (v. 1), as de Wette holds and expresses it.

3. *The virtues of faith: a.* with reference to *men*—it makes all believers brethren, because it makes them the children of God (v. 2); *b.* with reference to the *commandments of God*—it makes us strong and cheerful in obedience (v. 3), so that Bengel rightly observes: *in se sunt suavia; sed τὸ non gravia contradicit et occurrit iis, qui gravia esse putant; c.* with reference to the *world*—

it imparts courage for the conflict and power for the victory (vv. 4, 5). This it works with reference to men, at the same time changing them, transforming children of men into children of God, and causing such change to be perceived and received; with reference to the law of God and the world, it only changes believers by first giving to them the powers of the eternal life, and afterwards clear perception and a deeper understanding of the justice and blessing of the law and the transitoriness of the world.

4. *The necessity of faith:* without it one has neither Christ, nor God the Father, nor the Holy Spirit, nor the eternal life; consequently, without it and beside it there is no justification, no forgiveness of sins, no sanctification, no salvation (v. 12).

5. *The liberty of faith:* all men are to believe according to the will of God, but coërcion of faith is not ordained; every man has the power of resistance (ὁ μὴ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ=ὁ μὴ πιστεύων, vv. 10, 12).

6. *The immorality of unbelief* follows from v. 1, and especially v. 10: not to believe God, to consider Him a liar, is like misbelief and despair, a shameful thing, and, as Luther says in the Catechism, a vice.

III. Concerning the Law.

1. It should be considered as a fact of the revelation of love, of paternal discipline.

2. It answers to the originally God-ordained human nature, which sin has corrupted and grace has healed; the burden and grievousness of it to men proves their state of sin, joy in it and obedience to it, their state of grace.

8. Of his own strength man cannot fulfil a single commandment; in this the Evangelical Church is right.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Do not separate faith and love! This is forbidden, 1. by the *origin* of faith in the regeneration from God who is Love, and 2. by its *object*, Jesus the Christ, in whom the love of God was manifested, and 8. by its *task*, to conquer the world through love.—Do not fail to distinguish between faith and love in the work of regeneration which is secured by the former, not by the latter, but do not sever them in the sphere of sanctification, where faith is the root of love, and love the many-branched crown of faith.—You may ascertain whether you have faith and are born again from 1. your love to God the Father, 2. from your love of the brethren, 8. from your obedience to the Divine commandments, 4. from your fight with the world in and around you.—Dr. Christian Friedrich Richter, physician at the Orphan House of Halle, in Franke's time, was the author of the Christian song: *Es kostet viel ein Christ zu sein*, etc. 'It costeth much to be a Christian and to live conformably to the mind of the pure Spirit, for nature finds it very hard, ever to be reconciled to the death of Christ,' and the companion verse: 'It is not difficult to be a Christian and to live conformably to the mind of the pure Spirit, for though nature finds it very hard, etc.' Both are true and good. For the law is only a burden to man enfeebled by sin, but not to the Christian strengthened by grace, the one, indeed, is only *enjoined* to be good, but the other is enabled to be good.—Obedience to the Divine commandments notes the recovery of the Spirit, disobedience notes its decay. Nothing is more natural, nothing more adapted to human nature created by God after His own Image, than the Will of God, consistent with His Nature and expressed in the lovingly ordained Law for the benefit of His Kingdom, which was given, not against man, but for man, not against man, but against sin.—Learn from John how to contend with error! With all his resoluteness and decision, he is so objective and calm, and reasons so joyfully on the foundation of truth, that we are not even induced to make a personal application of his reasoning to others, but rather influenced to make it the test of our own standing.

Augustine:—*Qui habet in memoria et servat in vita, qui habet in sermonibus et servat in moribus, qui habet audiendo et servat faciendo, aut qui habet faciendo, et servat perseverando, ipse est, qui diligit Deum. Opere est demonstranda dilectio ne sit infructuosa nominis appellatio.*—You adore the Head, and offend the members. He loves His Body. Just as if somebody would desire to kiss your head, and at the same time trample with nailed shoes on your feet. Would you not decline the proffered demonstration of honour and exclaim: What are you about? You tread on my feet? The head would cry more for the trodden members than make account of being honoured.

Spener:—The meaning is not, that the keeping of the Divine commandments does not require considerable pains, labour and diligence, for that would contradict Luke xiii. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 7.—The difficulty applies to a burden so oppressive and painful as to be unbearable.—Spiritual life is, as to its nature, an eternal life, and consists as well in the grace of God which forgives sin and imparts new Divine strength, as also in the enjoyment of eternal felicity and glory.

Starke:—Christianity is not a sham, but a true and honest thing which has its foundation, its coat of arms and tokens, its works and fruits, its profit and happiness.—If thou hast a sense of shame and honour, thou wilt surely not hurt the saintly children of a saintly father; look, believers are the children of thy heavenly Father; if instead of loving, thou hate them, thou art truly an enemy of God, their Father, and He, in His turn, thy enemy.—If thoughtful preachers stop long at one matter, and perhaps repeat it several times, and with changed phraseology make it more clear, be not impatient of it, but take note of their zeal and of the importance and necessity of the matter treated of.—O, how much pain, burden, difficulty and anxiety attend the children of the world in their sins and iniquities, of which the children of God are free and delivered! Thus many a child of Satan has more trouble to find hell, than a child of God to find heaven.—O man, do not persuade thyself and do not suffer thyself to be persuaded, that the world cannot be overcome. This is the infallible sign of true and false faith: viz., whether thou conquerest the world, or sufferest the world to conquer thee.—The children of God are soldiers and knights. The crown must be fought for; faith is victorious. Wretched man, if conquest and the crowning do not attend thy course! World,

begone beneath my feet. We will trample under foot lions and vipers. Come hither, sword of the Lord! The blessed state of a righteous man in Christ, his Head! He does not fortify the walls of houses and cities, but the empire of Satan and the walls of Jericho in his heart.—The stronger thy faith, the greater thy victory over sin, the world, death, the devil and hell.—The Bible surpasses, and should be preferred to, all books; all other good books are conducted like rivulets from this river.—Christ is not only the foundation, but also the true centre and chief work of our faith, at which alone the believer under the practice of self-denial, is ever aiming, and into which he does, as it were, ground himself.—As there is nothing more excellent than faith, so is nothing more dishonourable than unbelief. Faith honours God, and is the mother of all virtues; unbelief dishonours God, and is the mother of all vices.—Man must not seek the true life any where except in Christ; nor cherish any hope of life beside Him. As long as he is without Christ, he has no life; whereas the degree to which he is in Christ and partaker of His Being, is also the measure of his life.—A true Christian is a veritable Christophorus, who carries Christ in his heart, and leads his life in Him.—

Besser:—If thou art a conqueror, thou must have thy spoils to show.—The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life are the chief trophies, of which the soldiers of Christ divest the conquered world, and which they suspend from the victorious banner of the cross.—

Heubner:—Without prejudice to the general love of man, a Christian must be especially attracted to those who are of one mind with him; he must value the true children of God infinitely more than the unconverted.—The genuineness and holiness of human love betokened by its religious character.—All love is worthless without religion, a mere natural impulse, or masked selfishness.—True love is allied to strict conscientiousness; love must not render us languid or indulgent in respect of duty.—If the love to God requires obedience, the true love of man also must consist in obedience, fidelity and conscientiousness.—Struggle for this strength (v. 8); to be ever complaining is a bad sign.—1. The light of faith conquers the errors, illusions and delusions of false wisdom, it sees through them, perceives their nothingness and masters them; the word of Christ is the eternal, unchangeable truth; faith the pole-star, that we do not swerve from the truth. 2. Faith conquers the allurings and fascinations of the world which we encounter in its lusts, its riches and honours; it conquers them by the love of Christ, by the heavenly riches and the eternal glory, which it discloses. 3. It conquers the threatenings of the world, the obstacles which it raises, its persecutions; the call of Christ to us is too mighty, and the crown of honour offered to us causes us to despise the contempt of the world.—This (viz. the conquest of the world) is an idea peculiar to Christianity, because it only teaches the contrast of the kingdom of God and the world.—A lofty thought, to face the whole world and to conquer it! This is a greater task than that of the world-conquerors; they are servants of the world.—Unbelief is an offence against the Majesty of God, a denial of the holy miracles in the moral world, which God has wrought.—

V. 1. L. in Gesetz und Zeugniss, 1859:—*When does the feast of the Nativity become to us the birth-day of a new life?* When its glad tidings excite in us anew 1. *the undoubting faith* that Jesus is the Christ; but also 2. *grateful love* to God, and to all those who are our brethren in Christ.

On v. 4. Spurgeon:—*A great victory, a great birth, a great grace.*

Danneil:—*The Christian's warfare.* 1. The *warrior* (born of God); 2. The *enemy* (the world); 3. The *victory* (faith).

Genthe, on the tercentenary Anniversary, 1860, Baptismal Address. *How Melanchthon conquered the world in the strength of faith;* 1. The *temptation* of the world; 2. The *opposition* of the world; 3. The *fear* of the world.

V. 5. Schleiermacher:—*Our Christmas-joy is closely connected with the fact that the faith, that Jesus is the Son of God, is the victory which conquers the world.* 1. The object of the festal joy, that in Jesus is born the Son of God, surpasses all similar events in our family and social life, for through Him we are made well-pleasing to God. 2. The world is destined to be conquered, judged, and destroyed as to its transitory and corruptible side, but to become more and more blessed as to its Divine side, and this has been done in Christ and through Christ in believers, so that it is one and the same thing to say: the the Son of God conquers the world through our faith, and our faith conquers the world through Him.

Vv. 9–12. F. A. Wolf:—*Christ the Author and Giver of a living religion.* 1. Explain and prove that this is true of Christ as a *Witness*, an *Ensample*, and a *Surety*. 2. The inferences: *a.* Christianity has nothing to fear from all-changing time, from false love of novelty, and from true zeal for improvement; *b.* test the genuineness of your own Christianity by the vitality of the faith that is in you.

Vv. 1–13. Petri:—*The Easter-faith, that Jesus is the Christ.* 1. That we become anew conscious of the wholesome virtues of this faith; 2. and edify ourselves on this our most holy faith.

On the Epistle for *Dom. Quasimodogeniti* [First Sunday after Easter—M.] vv. 4–10.

Heubner:—*The great value of faith in Jesus Christ.* 1. How it manifests itself: *a.* in its *power*: it makes us the children of God and conquers the world (vv. 4, 5); *b.* in its *certainty:* it is supported by the testimony of God (vv. 6–8); 2. The duties it enjoins upon us: *a.* it warns us against contempt of faith (v. 9), and *b.* it lays us under the obligation to receive the testimony of God (v. 10).

Faith in Christ the good part of younger Christians (Candidates for Confirmation). 1. Proof: this faith makes them the children of God; preserves them from the world. 2. How do they acquire this faith? By diligent consideration of the testimonies for Jesus, and by ready obedience.

Continued provision for grown-up children, 1. In what it consists; 2. What makes it our bounden duty.—

R. Stier:—*What John means by conquering the world?* Our faith must conquer 1. The *unbelief*

of the world; 2. The *sin and seduction* of the world; 3. The *enmity* of the world.—

What sort of faith does conquer the world? 1. Faith in Him, who also was not of the world, but the eternal brightness of the glory of the Father, and the express image of His Person; 2. Faith in Jesus, the Conqueror of the world.—

KAPFF:—*The Confirmation of regeneration.* 1. How the regeneration of mankind is confirmed in Christ; 2. How it is confirmed in individual hearts; 3. What influence in that direction outward confirmation has.

GENZKEN:—Build yourselves up on faith by the Holy Ghost. 1. *This is needful* for the regenerate, as feeble newly-born persons (v. 4); 2. *But the foundation, which is laid, stands firm like a rock* (v. 5); and the Prince of life evermore joins us in the Holy Communion (v. 6); 3. The *Holy Spirit* bears testimony concerning *the truth of His word*, and the *power of His life* (vv. 6, 8–11).

F. W. KRUMMACHER:—The threefold testimony for Jesus the Messiah and Saviour of the world 1. in the water; 2. in the blood; 3. in the Holy Spirit.

BEYER (in Gesetz und Zeugniss for 1862):—*A test of Faith!* 1. Dost thou know the *victory*, whereby faith verifies itself? 2. The *fountain*, whence it daily draws fresh nourishment? 3. The *testimony* which gives it assurance?—

The testimony of God concerning His Son, 1. to us; 2. in us; 3. by us.

The victorious power of faith, 1. against the sin of the world, 2. against the lie of the world.

Our faith is the victory which conquers the world. 1. What sort of faith is it? 2. How is it obtained? 3. How does it conquer the world?—

[VER. 2. MACKNIGHT:—The intention of the Apostle was to show, how we may know when we love the children of God in a right manner. Now this was necessary to be shown, since men may love the children of God because they are their relations, or because they are engaged in the same pursuits with themselves, or because they are mutually united by some common bond of friendship. But love proceeding from these considerations is not the love of the children of God which He requires. By what mark then can we know, that our love to the children of God is of the right sort? "By this," saith the Apostle, "we may know that we love the children of God" in a right manner, "when we love God and" from that excellent principle, "keep His commandments," especially His commandment to love His children, because they bear His Image. True Christian love therefore is that which proceeds from love to God, from a regard to His will, and which leadeth us to obey all His commandments.—M.].

[VER. 3. PUSEY:—"For nothing is grievous or burdensome to him who loves. They are not grievous, because love makes them light; they are not grievous, because Christ gives strength to bear them. Wings are no weight to the bird, which they lift up in the air until it is lost in the sky above us, and we see it no more, and hear only its note of thanks. God's commands are no weight to the soul, which, through His Spirit, He upbears to Himself; nay, rather, the soul, through them, the more soars aloft and loses itself in the love of God."

VER. 4. "'They are not grievous, because every thing which is born of God overcometh the world.' He saith not only whosoever, but 'every thing which,' showing the largeness of the gifts. 'Every thing,' of every sex or age time or clime, 'which is born of God, overcometh the world,' and that not of themselves, but of the gift of God; not they, but the power, through their new birth, in-born in them, faith, love, grace, from God, unto God, and they, as wielding in them a power not their own, overcome the world.—'The commandments of God are not grievous,' because we have a power implanted in us mightier than all which would dispute the sway of God's commandments and God's love, a power which would lift us above all hindrances, carry us over all temptations, impel our listlessness, sweep with it whatever opposes it, sweep with it even the dulness or sluggishness of our own wills, the Almighty power of the grace of God."

"This is the victory, by which the martyrs overcame, by which the weak became strong, and, in Divine strength, mastered the strong; the strength of endurance wearied out the brutal might of affliction; children overcame their oppressor; the ignorant took captive the learning of the world; fishermen and the tent-maker subdued the world; the dying conquered the living; the blood of martyrs became the harvest-seed of the church. By faith, St. Paul says, 'they subdued kingdoms;' by faith St. Peter bids us resist the evil one. For faith knits us to Christ; faith obtains for us the power of Christ; faith prevails with Him who is Almighty, and overcomes the world, for it has power with Him who has power over the world."

"Faith binds us to Him, who is Almighty; but faith, too, opens our own eyes to things invisible. It imparts to us of the power of the All-Powerful, of the wisdom of the All-Wise. It gives us to see the nothingness of all things which are but for a time. It opens our eyes to the majesty and beauty of things eternal. What to us are things which perish in the grasp? What to us are things of time and sense, save as they speak of that which lives when time shall cease to be, or as they shall themselves live on, purified but indestructible? One only is above us, He who made us. All we see is below us. His friends we may be, His we have been made, who is Lord of the world. The world itself, and all which is in the world, is for our use, subject to us, as we to God. All things beautiful to sight, sweet to taste, transporting in sound, pleasant to smell, and thrilling to touch, all things are ours and for us, if used in obedience to their and our Maker. But we are above them. They were made for us, not we for them; they are made to serve us, not we to be slaves to them. Faith shows us Him who is above all things, but in all things; immortal, invisible, incomprehensible, in light unapproachable, yet who willeth to come unto us, and make His abode in us. God made us, because He willed to impart Himself to us. He made us, not that He needed us, but to show us His love. He has made us for Himself, He willed not to make us apart from Himself. He willed to join us to Himself. He who hath and is all things, of which we have the

shadow here below, 'the true riches of wisdom, and spiritual delight, royal glory, eternal peace, a kingdom incorruptible, eternal joy, overflowing peace, true bliss, certain knowledge' (Laurentius), pleasure for evermore, He willeth to give thee all which is His, and much more, He willeth to give thee Himself. Why shall we not trust Him with the things of time, or with ourselves, who must trust Him with our eternity? Why not trust that, for these few days and years, He will provide for us, whom He has made for His love, if He will not have it, in those countless ages which time measures not?"—M.].

[SECKER:—Presumption in our strength is destructive to our virtue; confidence of our own merit is injurious to our Maker; but a deep sense of human unworthiness and of Divine grace will inspire us with that lowliness of heart, which God will accept, and that vigilance of conduct, which He will bless. "This," therefore, "is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."—M.].

[VER. 6. PYLE:—"Nor are the effects and influences of this great truth more excellent and noble than is the ground and foundation of it strong and certain. The testimonies given Him at His baptism, when God by a voice from heaven declared Him to be His beloved Son, the Saviour of mankind: the miracles at His crucifixion, when at the shedding of His innocent blood, we saw both water and blood come out of His side; the sun was darkened; the earth trembled, and the vail of the temple was rent; the signs and wonders done by Him, and by others in His name; these three, respectively denoted by 'the water,' 'the blood,' and 'the Spirit,' are all testimonies of the authority of His Person and mission, most unexceptionable, as being evidences of that Holy Spirit that cannot deceive us."—M.].

[VER. 12. SHERLOCK:—"If we reflect upon the holiness of God, and His hatred of sin and iniquity, and begin to fear that He can never be reconciled to sinners; let us take courage; the work is difficult, but the Son of God has undertaken it; and how great soever the distance between God and us is, yet through the Son we have access to Him. If we still fear for ourselves, that all may again be lost through our own weakness and inability to do good; even here help is at hand, the Spirit of God is our support, He is the pledge and earnest of our redemption. These being the necessary means of salvation it was necessary to reveal to the world the doctrines concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit: and the belief of these doctrines is necessary to every Christian, as far as the right use of the means depends on the right faith and belief of the doctrines. 'He that hath the Son,' saith St. John, 'hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life;' and again: 'whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father.' For since we can only come to the Father through the Son, to deny the Son is to cut off all communication between us and the Father. The same may be said of the blessed Spirit, through whom we are in Christ: 'If any man,' says St. Paul, 'have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.' Our blessed Lord has Himself told us, that 'this is life eternal, that we may know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent.'"—M.].

[*Sermons*, etc.

v. 1. HOWE, JOHN, On Regeneration. Works, 8, 484.

v. 3. TILLOTSON, Abp., The Precepts of Christianity not grievous. Serm. i. 152.

OSTERWALD, J. F., Qu'il est nécessaire et facile de garder les commandements de Dieu. Sermons, 79.

WARDLAW, R., On the identity of morality and religion. Christian Ethics, 240.

SHERLOCK, W., Obedience the best evidence of our love to God. Sermons, ii. 44.

v. 4. ALLEINE, R., The world conqueror. 8vo. 1676.

HARE, J C., The victory of faith.

Faith the victory that overcometh the world.—Faith a practical principle.—Office and province of faith.—Power of faith in man's natural life.—Power of faith among the heathen and among the Jews.

PYLE, P., The Christian's victory over the world. Sermons, iv. 503.

vv. 7, 8. Among the controversial writers on these verses the following have supported their *genuineness*: Dr. MILL, T. SMITH, KETTNER, DAVID MARTIN, CALAMY, CALMET, SLOSS, TRAVIS, HEY, BUTLER, MIDDLETON, NOLAN, HALES, ALBER, BP. BURGESS, JOHN JONES, CARD. WISEMAN; the following assert their *spuriousness*: SIMON, EMLYN, SIR ISAAC NEWTON, BENSON, PORSON, MARSH, GRIESBACH, A. CLARKE, JOWETT, TURTON, ORME, SCHOLZ, HORNE and the authors named above in *Exegetical and Critical*. Our limits do not allow us to give the titles of the books in this controversy, which is a library in itself.

v. 10. BAXTER, W., Christ's witness within us, the believer's special advantage against temptations to infidelity. Works, xx. 129.

WATTS, I., The inward witness to Christianity. 3 Serm. Works, i. 1.

MELVILL, HENRY, The witness in oneself. Lecture 58.

vv. 11, 12. STEDMAN, ROWLAND, The mystical union of believers with Christ; or a treatise wherein that great mystery and privilege of the saints' union with the Son of God is opened. 8vo. London, 1668.—M.].

IV. THE CONCLUSION.

Chapter V. 13-21.

13 These things have I written[1] unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God;
that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe[2] on the name of
14 the Son of God. And this is the confidence that we have in him[3], that, if we ask any
15 thing[4] according to his will, he heareth us: And if we know that he hear[5] us, what-
16 soever we ask[6], we know that we have the petitions that we desired of[7] him. If any
man see his brother sin a sin[8] *which is* not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give
him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say
17 that he shall pray for it[9]. All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not[10] unto
18 death. We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begot-
19 ten[11] of God keepeth himself, and that[12] wicked one toucheth him not. *And* we know
20 that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness[13]. And[14] we know that
the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding[15], that we may know[16] him
that is true[17]; and we are in him that is true[17], *even* in his Son Jesus Christ. This is
21 the true God, and eternal life[18]. Little children, keep yourselves[19] from idols. Amen[20].

Verse 13. [1 German: "These things wrote I."—M.]

2 τοῖς πιστεύουσιν B. Cod. Sin.; οἱ πιστεύοντες A.; this reading is preferable on account of the witnesses and because it is *difficilior*.—Text. Rec. inserts after ὑμῖν, "τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ," and continues after αἰώνιον, "ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα κ. τ. λ.;" but this reading is not sufficiently authenticated, and probably not without dependence on Jno. xx. 31. [The Codd. A. B. Sin. al. Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, Aethiopic, Armenian, Cassiod., Bede, al. are all against the reading of Rec.—But the reading οἱ πιστεύοντες, though found in A. and many Versions, is not clearly established; it seems to have been the basis of the reading of Text. Rec.—Αἰώνιον before ἔχετε Sin. G. K. al. Theoph., Oecum.; after ἔχετε A. B. al. Vulg. Syr. Rec. Cassiod., Bede.—The most probable reading is: ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Huther, Alford.—M.]

[German: "These things wrote I unto you, that ye may know, that ye have eternal life, ye that believe in the name of the Son of God."—M.]

Verse 14. [3 German: "towards Him."—M.]

4 ὅτι ἐάν τι B. Sin.; ὅ τι ἄν A. [German: "If we ask something."—M.]

Verse 15. 5 καὶ ἐὰν οἴδαμεν, ὅτι ἀκούει ἡμῶν, omitted in A. and Sin., but added by a later hand. [German: "And if we know, that He heareth us."—M.]

6 ὃ ἐὰν Sin. B. G. al.; ὃ ἂν A. K. al. The Codd. are undecided here, and in the beginning after καί, between ἐὰν and ἄν. [German: "whatsoever we may ask."—M.]

7 ἀπ' αὐτοῦ B. Sin.; παρ' αὐτοῦ A. G. K. [German: "which we have asked from Him;" Lillie, Alford.—M.]

Verse 16. [8 German: "If any man see his brother commit a sin not unto death;" Alford, Lillie: "sinning a sin."—M.]

[9 German: "Concerning that I do not say, that he shall pray." Similarly Alford, Lillie, al.—M.]

Verse 17. 10 οὐ πρὸς θάνατον is well authenticated; Vulg. Aeth. omit οὐ; μὴ is too feebly sustained.

[11 German: "Born of God" as in the beginning of the verse; the variation is unnecessary.—M.]

[12 German: "And the wicked one."—M.]

Verse 19. [13 German: "And the whole world lieth in the wicked one." So Alford, Lillie, following Syriac, Vulg. and many others.—M.]

Verse 20. 14 οἴδαμεν δὲ B. K. Sin.—A. al. καὶ οἴδαμεν.—G. al. omit δὲ and καί, as in the beginning of v. 18. [German: "But we know," so Lillie; Alford "Moreover, etc."—M.]

[15 German: "a sense."—M.]

16 γινώσκομεν A. B.* G. Sin.; γινώσκωμεν, B.** K. al.

17 After τὸν ἀληθινόν A., several minusc., versions, al. insert θεόν; Sin. had originally τὸ, but corrected into τόν. [German: "The true One," so Lillie, Alford, following many translators.—M.]

18 ζωὴ αἰώνιος, without the Article, is well authenticated; some minusc., add it. John nowhere makes use of ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, but ζωὴ αἰώνιος, or ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, or ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος.

Verse 21. 19 ἑαυτοὺς is better authenticated than ἑαυτά.

20 ἀμήν G. K. al.; [it is omitted in A. B. Sin. al.—M.]—The subscription: ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ A., Sin. and al.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The Conclusion. v. 13. **These things wrote I.**—Ταῦτα ἔγραψα, like ταῦτα ἔγραψα ch. ii. 26, might be referred to the verses immediately preceding, if the words annexed permitted such a construction:

That ye may know, that ye have eternal life, ye that believe in the name of the Son of God.—Quite similar to the closing verse of the Gospel, ch. xx. 31. The purpose of the writing ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον corresponds with the χαρά at the beginning of the Epistle, which χαρά was to be filled by the testimony of the eye- and ear-witnesses of the λόγος τῆς ζωῆς; hence ταῦτα ἔγραψα answers to ταῦτα γράφομεν ch. i. 4 (Bengel), the certainty of the possession of eternal life being the ground and strength of the joy, which John has, and to which he adverts. The words τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, annexed to ὑμῖν, primarily refer back to ch. iii. 23, but find their last resting-place in the κοινωνία ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ch. i. 3. Hence ταῦτα must be referred neither to vv. 6-12 (Huther), nor to vv. 1-12 (S. Schmid), but to the whole Epistle (Luther, Bengel, Lücke, Düsterdieck and al.), though the inducement to the choice of this expression lies in verses immediately preceding.

and preparing the concluding portion of the Epistle, and there still follow several verses which constitute that concluding portion. Noteworthy is the difference between the closing verse of the Gospel, ch. xx. 31, which adverts to the future believing and obtaining eternal life of the readers, while our passage asserts their present belief and possession of eternal life. [Alford sees here with Düsterdieck something like an anticipatory close of the Epistle. Huther maintains, that this verse still belongs to the second main part of the Epistle beginning with ch. iii. 23, on the ground that ζωὴν αἰώνιον goes back to the verses immediately preceding, and that πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, refers back to ch. iii. 23.—M.].

The confidence that prayer is heard. vv. 14, 15.

Ver. 14. **And this is the confidence which we have towards Him.**—Καὶ connects with what goes before, *i. e.*, it connects παῤῥησία ἣν ἔχομεν with ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον. This confidence consists in this:—

That if we ask any thing according to His will, He heareth us.—It is consequently the confidence in God, which has the intercourse of prayer with Him; this confidence rests on the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, springs from it, points back to it, and reacts also on it, strengthening and confirming it. Cf. ch. iii. 21, 22.—Πρὸς αὐτὸν and τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ must be referred to God the Father, because the idea of possessing the ζωὴ αἰώνιος involves the idea of the Divine Sonship, and the παῤῥησία is connected with both. While ἐάν τι leaves the object of the prayer quite general and indefinite, κατὰ τὸ θέλημα limits it, so that it is a *conditio æquissima, latissime patens* (Bengel), as we may see from the fourth and seventh petitions of the Lord's Prayer, in connection with the others. (Cf. *Doctrinal and Ethical* No. 1.).—Ἀκούει ἡμῶν denotes an attentive, sympathetic hearing, while ἡμᾶς would signify a mere hearing.—This is an undoubted fact:

Ver. 15. **And if we know that He heareth us whatsoever we may ask.**—Hence ἐὰν with the Indicative οἴδαμεν. Winer, p. 310, sq.—Ὃ ἐὰν αἰτώμεθα denotes the general character of the object of prayer. It follows that:

We know that we have the petitions which we have asked from Him.—Ἔχομεν, emphatic, placed first. By the side of ἀκούει ἡμῶν, we must distinguish ἔχομεν τὰ αἰτήματα (Lorinus: *res petitæ*), although the two belong together; God hearing our prayers and our having go hand-in-hand. The additional clause: ἃ ᾐτήκαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ indicates that the having is the consequence of prayer preceding it, so that the having in point of time does not coincide with the prayer, as does the believer's prayer with God's hearing; but our having is secured; ἔχομεν is not=λαμβάνομεν (Lachmann and al.), nor must it be construed like a Future (Grotius: *statim exaudit, at non statim dat*).—Ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, as in Matth. xx. 20, belongs to ᾐτήκαμεν, not to ἔχομεν; παρ' αὐτοῦ, as in Acts iii. 2, (see Appar. Crit., No. 7,), could not, at any rate, denote prayers as deposits made with God, as Ebrard maintains.

Intercession for a brother sinning not unto death. vv. 16, 17.

Ver. 16. **If any one see his brother commit a sin, not unto death.**—Here is supposed a specific case, in which the confident petition becomes an intercession for the purpose of keeping an erring brother,—after the example of Christ (ch. ii. 1; cf. Luke xxii. 31, 32; Jno. xvii. 9; Heb. vii. 25),—with his Saviour and salvation, in fellowship with the Redeemer and in the participation of eternal life. *Additur casus omnium maximus; ut possis orare etiam pro altero in re gravissima* (Bengel). Ἐάν τις ἴδῃ supposes an objective possibility; it is not said that some one does see, but it may be, the event will show it; consequently: If any one *should see* it. Winer, p. 306, sq. The reference is to an event which may be seen, to a fact susceptible of observation, as in ch. iii. 17.—Τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, denotes a member of the Christian Church, and τις requires to be taken in the same sense. The reference is consequently to intimate converse, and to what happens and becomes manifest there. This the Apostle brings out emphatically in the participial form: ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν: the sinning brother stands, as it were, before our eyes. Here we have μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, not as in v. 17: οὐ πρὸς θάνατον, because the reference is to the subjective judgment of the observer, not to an objectively valid principle, not to the establishment of a dogmatically real idea. Winer, p. 496.—Ἀδελφὸς is therefore not=*proximus quicunque* (Calov); non-christians are excluded (against Ebrard), although the reference may not be exactly to "a regenerate person" (Düsterdieck).

He shall ask and give him life.—The Future αἰτήσει denotes that the intercession may be confidently expected, since καὶ δώσει neither warrants us to construe the Future, in the decisive language of the legislation of the Old and New Testament (Matth. v. 21, 27, etc.,) as an Imperative, nor gives an occasion to assume a purely ethical possibility, as Luke xxii. 49: κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν; Rom. x. 14: πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται; shall we smite? how shall they, how can they call? See Winer, pp. 294, 295, 331. Hence it is not=*licebit petere* (S. Schmidt). The subject is the intercession, τις, not the Church (Neander), or the *saints* (Meyer). The same subject, αἰτῶν, belongs also to δώσει; it is neither=*dabitur* (variation of the Vulgate, approved by Bede and others), nor to be derived from the idea of prayer, αἰτούμενος, *rogatus Deus* (Beza, Bengel, Lücke, Winer, p. 558, and al.). [The Æthiopic version brings out the right meaning: *rogans vivificabit; i. e.* the asker shall be instrumental in bestowing life on the erring brother for whom he intercedes.—M.]. The grammatical requirements of our passage are fully borne out by the cycle of thoughts current in the New Testament (Acts iii. 6; Jas. v. 15, 20). John here simply contemplates the result as a fact, without adverting to the instrumentality, its ways and stages within the brother's heart, which was the object of intercession; repentance and faith, moreover, are not excluded, and the interceding brother is not viewed as the Saviour, or the representative of the Redeemer. Neither may we think of an *admonitio et correptio fraterna* (Matth. xviii. 15; S. Schmid), nor of the proper demeanour of the asker towards his erring brother, as the result of his intercessory prayer (Rickli). The final effect of intercession is ζωὴ (αἰώνιος), which is

weakened and disturbed by every sin [Alford; This bestowal of life by intercessory prayer, is not to be minutely inquired into, whether it is to be accompanied with "*correptio fraterna*,"—whether it consists in the giving to the sinner a repentant heart (Grotius, al.), but taken, as put by the Apostle, in all its simplicity and breadth. *Life*, viz.: the restoration of that Divine life from which by any act of sin he was indeed in peril, and indeed in process of falling, but this sin was not an actual fall.—M.].

To them that sin not unto death.—The Plural τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι belongs to αὐτῷ, which *generaliter positum est* (Erasmus); the Plural takes the supposed case from the sphere of singularity; τις has collective force. See Winer, p. 553. It is forced and ungrammatical to refer αὐτῷ to him that asks, understanding θεὸς as the subject, and taking τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι as *Dativ. commodi*: "God will give him life for the persons sinning," as Bornemann (*Biblische Studien der Sächs. Geistlichen* I. p. 71,) does.—Μὴ πρὸς θάνατον qualifies ἁμαρτάνειν ἁμαρτίαν, or ἁμαρτάνειν, and has consequently adverbial force. θάνατος, only, if taken in the sense of spiritual death, corresponds with the context, viz., with the παῤῥησία of prayer being heard on the ground of our possession of the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, for ζωή in the intercession on behalf of the erring brother, and the preposition πρὸς, as denoting the aim towards which something is directed (Winer, p. 428), require us to think of a sinning, which in the conviction of the person interceding, must not terminate in θάνατος, the emptying of all ζωὴ αἰώνιος, and accordingly must not absolutely annul fellowship with Christ, faith in Him. This is brought out more clearly in the next clause.

There is a sin unto death.—Thus the Apostle circumscribes the domain of sinning not unto death: it is not infinite. This is directed against any possible laxity in the judgment of the Church on the sins of believers. Πρὸς θάνατον has the same meaning here, as in the preceding clause. The reference is accordingly to a specific sin, to a simple act perceptible (ἴδῃ) in the brother, within the limits of Christian fellowship (τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ), not to a particular, outwardly marked category of sins, but to a sinning, and committing of sin, which renders it clear to the careful observer, that the fellowship of faith with Christ, the fountain of eternal life, has been cut off, that consequently the ethical life-form appears to be inwardly decayed and dying, that the moral status of that brother shows itself to be in a state of hopeless dissolution, so that it is of no avail to pray for such an one, and that therefore intercession is not proper. Hence it is wrong to transfer to this passage the Old Testament idea of חֵטְא לָמוּת, ἁμαρτία θανατηφόρος (Numb. xviii. 22), and to refer to capital crimes, *e. g.* idolatry, adultery, murder, incest, which are punishable with death under the secular or Mosaic law (Morus, al.), or to the sins ecclesiastically punishable with excommunication, as if intercession had to conform to the secular code of punishment; nor is the reference to sinning unto the end of man's earthly existence (Bede and al.), in which connection de Lyra rightly observes: "*Qui sit peccator non ad mortem, sciri non potest nisi per divinam revelationem;*" πρὸς θάνατον cannot be rendered "*usque ad mortem.*" Nor is the reference to the physically sick, Jas. v. 14 (Steinhofer); nor to definite, gross crimes, *peccatum gravissimum, quod vix remittitur* (Ambrose), *moechia port baptismum commissa* (Tertullian), *peccatum invidentiæ* (Bede). Nor is here any description of a condition, "*Talis animæ status, in quo fides et amor et spes, in summa, vita nova exstincta est; si quis sciens volensque mortem amplectitur, non ex illecebris carnis, sed ex amore peccati, sub ratione peccati; repudium gratiæ proæreticum.*" (Bengel). Augustine thought first of *invidentiæ faces post agnitionem Dei*, and added afterwards: *si in hac perversitate finierit vitam*, and then: *fidem deserere usque ad mortem.* Lastly the reference is neither to a purely inward act, like obduracy (Ebrard). apostasy (de Wette, Lücke), nor to sin, perceptible in the walk of men, like the antichristian denial expressed in words (Düsterdieck), nor to the sin against the Holy Ghost (Calvin, Sander and al.). The reference is simply to sinning, from which it may be perceived either, that no inward absolute severance from the faith and denial of Christ may or can be assumed, or that the latter is either recognizable or highly probable. To the latter case apply the words:

Concerning that I do not say that he shall pray.—The simple negation is, that the the Apostle says (οὐ—λέγω), that prayer should be made for him who sins unto death. He only makes prominent the circumstance that he confines himself to saying that intercession should be made for the person not sinning unto death. Hence those commentators are right, who do not see here a prohibition (Socinus, Grotius, Neander, Lücke, Huther and al.). But it is certainly not said that we ought, or only are permitted, to pray for him (Neander). It is important to note the difference of the words employed by the Apostle, for whereas before he made use of the word αἰτήσει, he now uses ἐρωτήσῃ: ἐρωτᾷν is=*rogare*, and implies equality on the part of the asker with him from whom the favour is sought; Jesus designates His praying by that term (Jno. xiv. 16; xvi. 26; xvii. 9, 15, 20); on the other hand αἰτεῖν is=*petere*, and implies inferiority (Düsterdieck), while Bengel regards αἰτεῖν as *species humilior* under the *genus* ἐρωτᾷν. This word ἐρωτᾷν denotes the confident petition of the child, praying inquiringly and expecting the gift. Hence, due regard being had to the force of the term employed, we may discover here the sanction of intercession for a brother sinning unto death, yet without any assurance of success or that the intercession will prevail. But since the Apostle advocates this very παῤῥησία and *Deus non vult, ut pii frustra orent* (Bengel), it is probably *locutio morata et attica* for a prohibition. Deut. iii. 26. This is also suggested by ἵνα; in the present instance he does not wish to excite and promote the purpose of praying. (Cf. *Doctrinal and Ethical* No. 4).

VER. 17. **All unrighteousness is sin.**—The subject πᾶσα ἀδικία reminds us of the predicate ἡ ἀνομία ch. iii. 4. 'Ανομία is in contradiction with the objectively given law of God, ἀδικία is the contradiction and negation of the δικαιοσύνη and is concerned with the subjective disposition,

though it be wrought from above and subject to the law. And this harmonizes with the fact that we are concerned with the moral status of the sinner in this sinning unto death, and sinning not unto death. John manifestly desires to guard against any ἀδικία being too lightly dealt with, being not considered as ἁμαρτία, though it be *μὴ πρὸς τὸν θάνατον*. The Roman Catholics, therefore, have no warrant for determining from the sin itself, whether it is *peccatum mortale* or *veniale*.

And there is a sin not unto death.—Καὶ simply connects the sequel; it is not=*et quidem*, and the sense: *quodlibet nefas est peccatum non ad mortem* (Bengel); Bengel's clause: '*sed ne quisquam id levius interpretetur, præmittit: est peccatum*' is only a moral reaction against the perversion of the Johannean thought: all unrighteousness is sin. The sequel, because of the intercession recommended, is added by way of emphasis. Οὐ *πρὸς θάνατον* implies the objectively real fact, the actual occurrence of such sin; it defines ἁμαρτία, not ἔστιν, as Luther supposes.

[There are one or two questions, in connection with this section, which require to be treated somewhat more fully. First, v. 17, involves a prohibition, or what is equivalent to it. But this has been denied by many commentators. "*Ora si velis, sed sub dubio impetrandi*" (Corn. a Lapide); Neander supposes that the offering of prayer is permitted, though the obtaining of it will be difficult, and arbitrarily imagines the prayer in question to be the collective prayer of the Church, and that one who sins *πρὸς θάνατον* should not be included in the common prayer of the Church, lest he might be confirmed in his sin; Huther finds in *οὐ λέγω* not more than a denial of the Apostle that the case of one sinning unto death came within the purview of his command. Lyra qualifies the prohibition, though "*non est orandum pro damnatis*," yet we may pray, "*ut minus peccaret, et per consequens minus damnaretur in inferno*."—Calvin recognizes the prohibition, but limits it to extreme cases, adding: "*Sed quia rarissime hoc accidit, et Deus, immensas gratiæ suæ divitias commendans, nos suo exemplo misericordes esse jubet: non temere in quemquam ferendum est mortis æternæ judicium, potius nos caritas ad bene sperandum flectat. Quod si desperata quorundam impietas non secus nobis apparet, ac sic Dominus eam digito monstraret, non est quod certemus cum justo Dei judicio, vel clementiores eo esse appetamus*."—Alford sums up: "Certainly this seems, reserving the question as to the nature of the sin, the right view of the *οὐ λέγω*. By an express command in the other case, and then as express an exclusion of this case from that command, nothing short of an implied prohibition can be conveyed."—

Secondly, the question: *What is the sin unto death?*—The canons of interpretation for its solution, and some of the principal divergences, chiefly from Düsterdieck, collected by Alford, are here produced.

"The FIRST canon of interpretation of the *ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον* and *οὐ πρὸς θάνατον* is this: that *the θάνατος and ζωή of the passage must correspond*. The former cannot be bodily death, while the latter is eternal and spiritual life. This clears away at once all those commentators who understand the sin unto death to be one for which bodily death is the punishment, either by human law generally, as Morus and G. Lange, or by the Mosaic law (Schöttgen),—or by sickness inflicted by God, as Whitby and Benson; or of which there will be no end till the death of the sinner (thought possible by Bede, and adopted by Lyra). This last is evidently absurd, for how is a man to know, whether this will be so or not?

"The SECOND canon will be, that this sin unto death being thus a sin leading to eternal death, being no further explained to the readers here, must be presumed as *meant to be understood by what the Evangelist has elsewhere laid down*, concerning the possession of life and death. Now we have from him a definition immediately preceding this, in v. 12, *ὁ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει τὴν ζωήν ὁ μὴ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ζωὴν οὐκ ἔχει*. And we may safely say that the words *πρὸς θάνατον* here are to be understood as meaning, "involving the loss of *this life* which men have only by the union with the Son of God." And this meaning they must have, not by implication only, which would be the case, if any obstinate and determined sin were meant, which would be a *sign* of the fact of severance from the life which is in Christ (see ch. iii. 14, 15, where the inference is of this kind), but directly and essentially, *i. e.* in respect of that very sin which is pointed at by them. Now against this canon are all those interpretations, far too numerous to mention, which make *any* atrocious and obstinate sin to be that intended. It is obvious that our limits are thus confined to *abnegation of Christ*, not as inferred by its fruits otherwise shown, but as the act of sin itself. And so, with various shades of difference, as to the putting forth in detail, most of the best commentators, both ancient and modern: *e. g.*, Aretius, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Corn. a Lapide, Tirinus, Baumgarten-Crusius, Lücke, Huther, Düsterdieck.

"The THIRD canon will help us to decide, within the above limits, what especial sin is intended. And it is, that by the very analogy of the context, it must be *not a state of sin, but an appreciable* ACT *of sin*, seeing that which is opposed to it *in the same kind*, as being not unto death, is described by *ἐάν τις ἴδῃ ἁμαρτάνοντα*. So that all interpretations which make it to be a *state* of apostacy, all such as, *e. g.*, Bengel's (see above), do not reach the matter of detail which is before the Apostle's mind.

"In enquiring what this is, we must be guided by the analogy of what St. John says elsewhere. *Our* state being that of life in Jesus Christ, there are those who have gone out from us, not being of us, ch. ii. 19, who are called *ἀντίχριστοι*, who not only "have not" Christ, but are Christ's enemies, denying the Father and the Son (ch. ii. 22), whom we are not even to receive into our houses nor to greet (2 John 10, 11). These seem to be the persons pointed at here, and this is the sin: viz. the denial that Jesus is the Christ, the incarnate Son of God. This alone of all sins bears upon it the stamp of severance from Him who is the Life itself. As the confession of Christ, with the mouth and in the heart, is salvation unto life (Rom. x. 9), so the denial of Christ, with the mouth and in the heart, is sin unto death. This alone of all the proposed solutions seems to satisfy all the canons above laid down. For in it the life cast away and the death incurred strictly correspond: it strictly corre-

sponds to what St. John has elsewhere said concerning life and death, and derives its explanation from those other passages, especially from the foregoing v. 12: and it is an appreciable act of sin, one against which the readers have been before repeatedly cautioned (ch. ii. 18 sqq.; iv. i. sqq.; v. 5, 11, 12). And further, it is in exact accordance with other passages of Scripture which seem to point at a sin similarly distinguished above others: Matth. xii. 31 sqq., and so far as the circumstances there dealt with allow common ground, with the more ethical passages, Heb. vi. 4 sqq., x. 25 sqq. In the former case, the Scribes and Pharisees were resisting the Holy Ghost (Acts vii. 51), who was manifesting God in the flesh in the person and work of Christ. For them the Lord Himself does not pray (Luke xxiii. 34): they knew what they did: they went out from God's people and were not of them: receiving and repudiating the testimony of the Holy Ghost to the Messiahship of Jesus."—M.].

Assurance of redemption. vv. 18, 20.

Ver. 18. **We know that every one who is born (out) of God, sinneth not.**—Each of these three concluding verses begins with *οἴδαμεν*; Bengel: *anaphora.* The Evangelist refers to *εἰδῆτε* v. 13, and thus describes the proper consciousness of the Christian in his attitude to sin (v. 18), the world (v. 19), and the Redeemer (v. 20). Πᾶς *γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ* signifies every one who is, and abides, born of God; the power of regeneration, of the life given and received in regeneration, operates from the past into the present; as such *οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει*, as such sin is foreign to him, Rom. vii. 20; cf. ch. iii. 9. —It is unnecessary to supply *πρὸς θάνατον* (Bede, Beza and al.), and arbitrary to understand an abiding in sin, or a falling from grace (Calvin), or the not frequent occurrence of the sin unto death and sin in general (de Wette).

But he that hath been born of God, keepeth himself, and the wicked one doth not touch him.—The opposite (*ἀλλά*), refers not only to the predicate, but, since the subject is particularly specified, to the whole clause, and the two clauses (*οἴδαμεν ὅτι*—and *ὁ γεννηθεὶς κ. τ. λ.*) are independently coördinated. The Aorist indicates the historical fact; that *hath been* born again (in opposition to Sander who discovers this in the Perfect, and Bengel, "*præteritum grandius quiddam sonat, quam aoristus; non modo qui magnum in regeneratione gradum assecutus, sed quilibet, qui regenitus est, servat se.*") Τηρεῖ *αὐτὸν* indicates moral effort and self-exertion; *οὐ φύσει εἰς ἀναμαρτησίαν προβαίνει* (Oecumenius); sin occurs, approaches, but he sustains the conflict, guarding himself in his peculiar nature and the Divine gift of eternal life, which hinders, spoils and drives away sin. Thus sin destroys man himself; it is in virtue of his self-guarding that the *σπέρμα τοῦ θεοῦ* abides in him (ch. iii. 9); we must neither supply *ἁγνόν* (1 Tim. v. 22), nor *ἄσπιλον* (Jas. i. 27. Carpzov, Lücke, al.), nor take *τηρεῖσθαι* in the sense of being on one's guard (Ebrard). Cf. ch. iii. 3. [Alford justly objects to this and similar expositions, and retaining the reading *α ὐ τ ό ν* A. B. Vulg. Jer., renders "*it* keepeth him," viz. the Divine birth, adding, "it is this, and not the fact of his own watchfulness, which preserves him from the touch of the wicked one, as in ch. iii. 9, where the same is imported by *ὅτι τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται.* The rationalistic commentators insist on *τηρεῖ ἑ α υ τ ό ν*, as showing, as Socinus, "*aliquid præstare eum atque efficere, qui per Christum regeneratus fuerit;*" and the orthodox commentators have but a lame apology to offer. Düsterdieck compares *ἁγνίζει ἑαυτόν*, ch. iii. 3. But the reference there is wholly different—viz. to a gradual and earnest striving after an ideal model; whereas here the *τηρεῖσθαι* must be, by the very nature of the case, so far complete that the wicked one cannot approach: and whose self-guarding can ensure this even for a day? Cf. Jno. xvii. 15, *ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ*, which is decisive."—M.]. The clause annexed by *καὶ* notes the difficult but successful conflict. The enemy, *ὁ πονηρὸς*, ch. iii. 12, is Satan, *οὐχ ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ*, though he would fain do it, hostile attacks, Satanic assaults, temptations are not wanting (1 Pet. v. 8); but the point of complication between Satan and the regenerate is not reached, the wrestling is wanting; the regenerate keeps Satan at a distance, wards him off; Bengel: *malignus appropinquat, ut musca ad lychnum, sed non nocet, ne tangit quidem.* "In the *πανοπλία τοῦ θεοῦ* he is guarded against all the *μεθοδεῖαι τοῦ διαβόλου* Eph. vi. 11 sqq." (Huther). Luther and Calvin also refer to the armour of God, so that, as in John xvii. 11, 12, 15; Rev. iii. 10, God is the Preserver [Calvin: "*Utut malignus renatum ad peccatum solicitet, tela tamen illius irrita cadunt, quoniam renatus scuto fidei munitus ea repellit et diabolo per fidem resistit.*"—M.]. But here the Apostle contemplates only the result, and not the way to it. Additions such as *letaliter* (Calvin), *finaliter* (E. Schmid), are unnecessary. But *ὁ πονηρὸς οὐχ ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ* depends of course on the careful *τηρεῖν ἑαυτὸν* (Düsterdieck, Huther). [Alford: "As the Prince of this world had nothing in our blessed Lord, even so on His faithful ones who live by His life, the Tempter has no *point d'appui*, by virtue of that their *γέννησις* by which they are as He is."—M.].

Ver. 19. **We know that we are (out) of God.**—The second *οἴδαμεν* repeats by way of introduction and in pregnant abbreviation (*ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμέν*), and with application to himself and his church, the believer's consciousness of his Divine sonship. There is no occasion whatever to understand here the peculiar revelation vouchsafed to the Apostles, or to explain *εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*=*a Deo pendere illique adhærere* (Socinus). The principal sentence is the independent clause, annexed like vv. 18, 20, by *καί*, viz.:

And the whole world lieth in the wicked one.—For the world is the territory and domain of Satan, on which account, and because *ὁ πονηρὸς* occurs in v. 18, and we have here an antithesis to *ὁ θεός*, *τῷ πονηρῷ* is masculine, and not neuter (Lyra, Socinus, Grotius, who however allows an allusion to Satan, Spener, Rickli and al.). Ἐν *τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται* denotes like *ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ κεῖται* (Polyb. VI. 14, 6), both the competency of Satan and dependence on him as the controlling power; in (*ἐν*) him lies the world, [it is circumscribed by him and in his power—M.]; *κεῖται* denotes the passiveness of the state, of the situation; he *ἅπτεται τοῦ κόσμου* continually in the most powerful and destructive manner

The ethical medium of sin is not expressed here, only the result is indicated. Referring here, with Spener and Steinhofer, to Is. xlvi. 3, and explaining it in analogy with regeneration, as if the world were lying in the wicked one like a child in its mother's womb, is false *per se* and not warranted by that passage wrongly rendered by Luther.—Ὁ κόσμος ὅλος refers to all the unregenerate; God's children do not belong to the world, though ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, yet are they not ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (Jno. xvii. 11, 16), not ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου (ch. iii. 8). Bengel well observes: "*Totus mundus, isque universus, eruditos, honestos, aliosve complectens omnes, exceptis duntaxat, qui Deo se et Christo vindicarunt, non modo non tangitur, sed plane jacet* (remains lying), *per idololatriam, cæcitatem, fraudem, vim, lasciviam, impietatem, malitiam omnem, in malo, expers et vitæ ex Deo et* διανοίας (1 Cor. v. 10; xi. 32). *Brevi hac summa vividissime denotatur horribilis status mundi. Commentarii loco est ipse mundus et mundanorum hominum actiones, sermones, contractus, lites, sodalitia.*" Hence our passage does not contradict ch. ii. 2; iv. 14. God aims at the redemption of the whole world through Christ and He is enough for the whole world; but Satan also, as the antagonist of God, aims at the whole world. The world is to be taken as the territory which embraces all, not as the sum-total produced by the adding together of all individuals. [Alford: "Had not Christ become a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, were He not the Saviour of the whole world, none could ever come out of the world and believe on Him; but as it is, they who believe on Him, come out and are separated from the world; so that our proposition here remains strictly true: the κόσμος is the negation of faith in Him, and as such lies in the wicked one, His adversary."—M.].

Ver. 20. **But we know, that the Son of God is come.**—The third οἴδαμεν whose object: ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἥκει, *i. e.*, has come; he conditions the εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ which continues in εἶναι ἐν τῷ θεῷ; had He not come, we should still lie like ὁ κόσμος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ. Hence it is=ἐφανερώθη ch. iii. 8 and not *adest* (Bengel referring to Mark viii. 3).—["δὲ closes off and sums up all: cf. 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Hebr. xiii. 22 al. This not being seen, it has been altered to καί, as there appeared to be no contrast with the preceding." Alford.—M.].

And hath given us a sense that we know the true One.—The subject of δέδωκεν is ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, not as Bengel *Deus*, as the Sender, ordaining the coming of Jesus. For Jesus is also the Mediator of the truth and of knowledge [*i. e.*, He bestows to us the truth and this knowledge—M.], (Düsterdieck). Διάνοια is the faculty or sense of knowing, not insight or knowledge (Lücke, de Wette), nor the activity of thinking out all the points in contrast with a faith void of thought (Paulus), 2 Pet. iii. 1; Eph. iv. 18; i. 18 (ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας or τῆς διανοίας), or mind (Matth. xxii. 37; Luke i. 51; Eph. ii. 3; Col. i. 21; 1 Pet. i. 13; Hebr. viii. 10; x. 16), *sensus cognoscendi* (Lyra), *sensus et gustus rerum divinarum* (a Lapide), the spiritual sense (1 Cor. ii. 12, 14), whose aim (ἵνα), but not whose substance is γινώσκειν τὸν ἀληθινόν. Cf. ch. ii. 3, 4; Jno. xvii. 3. The object of this cognition is evidently God, *qui re vera Deus est, ut eum ab idolis omnibus discernat* (Calvin), in contrast with every *Deus fictitius*. Bengel refers to the Son without any warrant for doing so.

And we are in the true One, in His Son Jesus Christ.—Another independent proposition annexed by καί, as in v. 19. Ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, designates, as before, God, which is also evident from the pronoun in ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ. This is the extreme antithesis of κεῖται ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ, the climax of εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. The words ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ fully denotes the Mediator, the ground and stay both of the knowledge and of the position of the believing child of God, and it denotes this by ἐν, not by διά, *in*, not *per*, in order to mark the permanent character of this life-fellowship; *inserimur in Christum et unum efficimur cum Deo.* Cf. ch. ii. 3–6; iii. 2. It is therefore no opposition, as seems to be assumed by the Vulgate (which connects by *et simus* with the clause beginning with ἵνα), Lyra, Erasmus and al.

This is the true God and eternal life.—Οὗτος like ἐκεῖνος, does not refer, as it were, in a merely mechanical manner, to the literally or locally nearest or more remote noun, but also to the noun, psychologically nearer or more remote. Winer, p. 175. Thus in v. 16, ἐκείνη did not refer to the grammatically and locally distant ἁμαρτία μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, but to the immediately preceding ἁμαρτία πρὸς τὸν θάνατον. So here the mediating Son is not in point of sense the nearest, but ὁ ἀληθινός. Under the influence of the christological conflicts it may have been natural, with reference to the Arian heresy which was joined by the more modern antitrinitarians, to refer οὗτος to the Son; but the discipline of grammar and language requires us to refer it to the Father (this has been done by most commentators, also by Hofmann, Schriftbeweis I. 146, down to Sander, Ebrard, Besser, Stier [*ad* Jno. xvii. 3. Vol. 5, p. 392] of our time), though the arrangement, the reference taken locally, might induce us to think of Christ, yet this is not the case, if the internal structure of the thought,—in which God the Father is the chief, and the Son simply the Mediator,—is attentively considered. But what does οὗτος refer to? To ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ. That would make: οὗτος (ὁ ἀληθινός)= ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός, but that would be weak and shallow. But if we take οὗτος, δεικτικῶς, of Christ, it is a terse and strong conclusion of the Epistle, and a powerful motive for the concluding exhortation.—The words: καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος belong to οὗτος. Grammatically it is not singular (Winer, p. 144), still less in point of thought: for God is essentially ζωή, and so is Christ (Jno. xiv. 6), even ζωὴ αἰώνιος. In like manner He is called φῶς (ch. i. 5), ἀγάπη (ch. iv. 8, 16), πνεῦμα (Jno. iv. 24). Bengel, on *vita æterna*, has the subtle note: "*initium epistolæ et finis conveniunt.*" It is therefore wrong to contend, that οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ought to be referred to the Son, as if His Divinity rested on this passage, and at the same time to overlook, that ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ denotes primarily God the Father, nor is it right to overlook here the tautology (this One, the true One, is the true God), and to apprehend an identification of the Father and the Son, which would be un-johannean, if the clause were referred to the Son. Now John dis-

tinguishes between the Father and the Son, but not between God and not-God. In the Son from the Father we have the Father, eternal life, and all that which is the Father's, and only in Him; hence this turn to the Son and the warning against all idols; the Son is the living Image, the Christian is in no point idolatrous! [Alford: "The grounds on which the application to *Christ* is rested are mainly the following: 1. that οὗτος, most naturally refers to the last mentioned substantive: 2. that ζωὴ αἰώνιος, as a predicate, more naturally belongs to the Son than to the Father: 3. that the sentence, if understood of God the Father, would be aimless, and tautological. But to these it has been well and decisively answered by Lücke and Düsterdieck: 1. that οὗτος more than once in St. John belongs not to the nearest substantive, but to the principal one in the foregoing sentence, *e. g.*, in ch. ii. 22 and in 2 Jno. 7: and that the subject of the whole here has been the Father, who is the ὁ ἀληθινός of the last verse, and the Son is referred back to Him as ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, thereby keeping *Him*, as the primary subject, before the mind; 2. that as little can ζωὴ αἰώνιος be an actual predicate of Christ, as of the Father. He is indeed ἡ ζωή ch. i. 2, but not ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Such an expression, used predicatively, leads us to look for some expression of our Lord's, or for some meaning which does not appear on the surface to guide us. And such an expression leading to such a meaning we have in Jno. xvii. 3, αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, ἵνα γινώσκωσιν σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. He is eternal life in Himself, as being the fount and origin of it: He is it to us, seeing that to know Him is to possess it. I own I cannot see, after this saying of our Lord with σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, how any one can imagine that the same Apostle can have had in these words any other reference than that which is given in those; 3. this charge is altogether inaccurate. As referred to the Father, there is in it no tautology and no aimlessness. It seems to identify the ὁ ἀληθινός mentioned before, in a solemn manner, and leads on to the concluding warning against false gods. As in another place the Apostle intensifies the nonpossession of the Son by including in it the alienation from the Father also, so here at the close of all, the ἀληθινὸς θεός, the fount of ζωὴ αἰώνιος, is put before us as the ultimate aim and end, to be approached ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ, but Himself the One Father both of Him and of us who live through Him."—M.].

Final request. v. 21: **Little children, keep yourselves from idols.**—Τεκνία indicates the affectionate warmth and depth of the Apostle. The exhortation φυλάξατε ἑαυτούς reminds them of great danger, against which they must be courageously on the alert; they themselves are exposed to great corruption. Bengel: "*Elegantia activi verbi cum pronomine reciproco plus dicit, quam: custodimini. Custodite vos ipsos, me absente,—neque solum ab eorum cultu, sed etiam ab omni eorum communione et communionis specie.*" Ἀπο τῶν εἰδώλων denotes, that believers must withdraw from the idols, surrounding and in immediate proximity to them, in order to be guarded against them. The εἴδωλα are figures of imaginary deities, and as contrasted with the true God, who is Eternal Life, denote the manufacture of the creature; the decisive point, or the thing decided here is not whether they are made with hands for the grossest forms of heathenism, or in imagination and thought for its more subtle forms; the real point is that they are self-made, untrue, unliving, and strictly speaking, nothing. 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 Cor. x. 19; xii. 2. Düsterdieck, therefore, is wrong in following here an *Etymologicum ineditum* in Biel, *sub voce* (τὸ μὲν εἴδωλον οὐδεμίαν ὑπόστασιν ἔχει, τὸ δὲ ὁμοίωμα τινῶν ἐστιν ἔνδαλμα), and making εἴδωλον tritons or centaurs, and ὁμοίωμα, constellations, men and beasts; the Diana of the Ephesians, forsooth, was also an εἴδωλον. Cf. Rom. i. 23, 25.—We are fully warranted to refer here, with Tertullian, Oecumenius, Düsterdieck and others, to idols proper, but equally warranted to refer also (with Bede, Rickli, Sander and others) to the self-made representations and ideas of the false teachers and their dupes, which, like the truth, they require to be received and submitted to. We may even see, with Ebrard, a reference to images of God or gods or saints in reality, or in imagination, for whom heathenish worship is required. The εἴδωλα are so dangerous because they are the objects of εἰδωλολατρεία. As this applied then to the church-frontier in contact with heathenism, so it applies at this time to the Mariolatry in the Church of Christ, and to the worship of genius, to Schiller-worship, etc., in His Church. [The literal and *figurative* reference in this closing charge, seems to be required by the context, and, in fact, by the whole tenor of the Epistle; the reference being both to literal idols, and to spiritual idolatry.—M.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The assurance that our prayers will be heard rests upon the life-fellowship with God the Father through faith in Christ, and forbids its being circumscribed, as to the substance of our prayers, within limits narrower than those given by the Lord Himself (Matth. vi. 9–13), but neither pursues any other course than that indicated in Matth. vi. 33, sq., viz., it expresses in the way of ethical effort what life really stands in need of. So St. Paul in Rom. viii. 14–17. Absolutely exaudible* is the prayer for the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts (Luke xi. 13), relatively exaudible are our prayers for temporal gifts *quantum non est impedimento ad salutem* (Matth. xxvi. 39).

2. Intercession is very potent (v. 16); it is a work of love, an act of kindness.

3. Every sin is, properly speaking, unto death, which is the wages of sin; there is no sin, which is not *per se* unto death, unto condemnation. In this respect, the maxim of the Stoics and Jovianus holds good, that *omnia peccata paria*, no matter how different they may be; and there is only one way towards the forgiveness and cancelling of sin, viz., Christ and His high-priestly work, and the fellowship of faith with the Sinless One. Consequently it is not the species or greatness of sin, *per se*, which constitutes it a sin unto death, but rather the effect of sin on the sinner's relation to the Redeemer, or the nature of the disturbance of this relation, as evidenced by sin.

* [I coin this word, which signifies "that which may be heard or granted," for want of a better term.—M.].

The sin which indicates a permanent falling away from Christ, is sin unto death. The Romish distinction of *peccatum mortale* and *peccatum veniale* and the restriction of the former to seven, is wrong; for there is always the danger that the sin assumed to be *peccatum veniale*, and received in excuse of it, may turn into *peccatum mortale*, and that that which from a lower standpoint appears as *peccatum veniale*, is afterwards in its further progress *peccatum mortale*.

4. Intercession for those who sin unto death is improper, because such intercession is inexaudible, because such sin cannot be forgiven. Cf. Riehm, *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs*, II., pp. 768–775. The words *ἀδύνατον—πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν* (Heb. vi. 4–6), as well as *οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι* (Matth. xii. 32) distinctly indicate the reason why the Apostle neither requires, nor advises us to make intercession for those sinning unto death. Cf. Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, II., p. 340, sqq. Intercession for suicides must, at all events, be judged from this stand-point.—[Jeremy Taylor: "Every Christian is in some degree in the state of grace, so long as he is invited to repentance, and so long as he is capable of the prayers of the Church. This we learn from those words of St. John: 'All unrighteousness is sin, and there is a sin not unto death,' that is, some sorts of sin are so incident to the condition of men, and their state of imperfection, that the man who hath committed them is still within the method of pardon, and hath not forfeited his title to the promises and covenant of repentance; but 'there is a sin unto death;' that is, some men proceed beyond the measures and economy of the Gospel, and the usual methods and probabilities of repentance, by obstinacy, and preserving a sin, by a wilful, spiteful resisting, or despising the offers of grace and the means of pardon; for such a man St. John does not encourage us to pray; if he be such a person as St. John described, our prayers will do him no good; but because no man can tell the last minute or period of pardon, nor just when a man is gone beyond the limit, and because the limit itself can be enlarged, and God's mercies stay for some longer than for others, therefore St. John left us under the indefinite restraint and caution; which was derogatory enough to represent that sad state of things in which the refractory and impenitent have immerged themselves, and yet so indefinite and cautious, that we may not be too forward in applying it to particulars, nor in prescribing measures to the Divine mercy, nor in passing final sentences upon our brother, before we have heard our Judge Himself speak. 'Sinning a sin not unto death,' is an expression fully signifying that there are some sins which though they be committed and displeased God, and must be repented of, and need many and mighty prayers for their pardon, yet the man is in the state of grace and pardon, that is, he is within the covenant of mercy; he may be admitted, if he will return to his duty: so that being in a state of grace is having a title to God's loving-kindness, a not being rejected of God, but a being beloved of Him to certain purposes of mercy, and that hath these measures and degrees."—M.].

5. The regenerate, as such, according to the spirit, does not sin, though the flesh ever and anon causes him to fall.

6. The sins of the regenerate are not unto death, because forgiveness and atonement are sought and found in Christ.

7. None but believing Christians, born of God, are not subject to the world-power of Satan; those who are subject to it, are least sensible of it; the Christian, who has become free, perceives and feels it in its hostility to him and his resistance to it.

8. Vital piety finds rest only in God, from whom it comes.

9. Although the absolute and immoveably fixed assurance (*certitudo*) of salvation, such as the Methodists and Baptists suppose to possess, is neither possible nor biblically established, yet we may attain unto a sure confidence (*fiducia*), and maintain it in opposition to the Romish decrees, which not only reject the impossibility of final apostasy, but also deny this confidence of the Christian (*Conc. Trid. Sess.* vi. 9, 15, sq.).

10. The Reformed are fully justified in their rejection of altars, images and similar *instrumenta superstitionum* with respect to the abuses of the Roman Catholics, and even down to the present time with their extreme Mariolatry, but they err in confounding the abuse of the several objects with the objects themselves and in changing the one into the other, in lodging complaints against the natural sphere of art instead of pressing it into the higher service [of religion—.]. The liberty of the Lutheran Church cannot be over-estimated.—Images of God will always remain hazardous, not only in the Zwinglian or Puritan sense.—

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Care for thy friends, that they may be and remain assured of the possession of eternal life, despite the temptations and troubles on earth.—Thou hast confidence in the purity of mind of some loved man, how much more shouldest thou confide in the true God?—If distrust is disgraceful and fraught with much unhappiness in our intercourse with men, how much more disgraceful and productive of unhappiness is distrust of the glorious God?—Seeing the light of the world in regeneration is no warrant that this Sun will always smile in His brightest light, unclouded and without stormy days, on the firmament of the soul; but we know, without the gift of prophecy, as the children of God, as Christians, that it is day.—Pray for everything, but be urgent unto intercession for thy erring brother. Prefer to speak of an erring brother to God than to other men.—Dismal is the high-mindedness which fancies that it can never fail with God, but equally dismal is the pusillanimity, which afraid that all is to no purpose, conducts to despair.—As a Christian be not a minor, but volunteer also to act as guardian.—Sin violates not only the Divine command before us, and the Majesty of God above us, but also the Image of God in us!—Every sin may become a sin unto death, as long as it remains unforgiven.—Every sin checks and disturbs the eternal life in thee; the greatest danger, however, is not the com-

mission of, but consenting unto sin, and this is the more dangerous, as your sensibility has become more acute and your will more resolute under the growth of sanctification.—Beware of genius-worship!—

LUTHER:—Thou must learn to cry and not sit down by thyself, or lie on a bench, with drooping head, or shaking it, and lacerate or consume thyself with thy anxious thoughts, caring and fretting how to get free, and regarding nothing except thy own misery and ill-fortune, and wretchedness. But come, idler that thou art, fall down on thy knees, lift up thy hands and eyes to heaven, sing a psalm or say the Lord's prayer, and lay thy trouble before God, and with streaming eyes pour forth thy supplications and make known thy wants.—Prayer, the opening of our grief, the lifting up of our hands, are the sacrifices which are most acceptable to God.—He Himself desires thee to acquaint Him with thy distress, instead of burdening and oppressing, of torturing and lacerating thyself with it, and thus multiplying one calamity into ten or a hundred. He wants thee to be too weak to carry and overcome such a load, that thou mayest learn to grow strong in Him, and that He may be glorified in thee through His strength. Behold the opposite course makes people who are *called* Christians, but nothing else than vain babblers and praters, who see much of faith and the Spirit, but know not what it is, or what they see.

STARKE:—Holy Scripture is our Epistle of God to us, in which He reveals to us His gracious will, as it were, in His own handwriting, and His purpose to give us eternal life.—Faith is never too strong, it may and must grow stronger. Where is confidence of faith, there is joyfulness. The more faith gets filled with the riches of God, the more jubilant is its rejoicing in the abundance of its satisfaction: it is heaven on earth!—The prayer of the lip must be joined to the desire of the heart.—Wouldest thou pray so that thy prayers shall be heard, thou must be full of faith, holy, and a child of God, otherwise thou art abominable.—Prayer is not only a Christian duty, but a glorious benefit. Simplicity is not ignorance. The former befits the Christian, but not the latter. Christians must know. Ignorant Christians are unchristian.—Learned but ungodly men are unlearned; the regenerate are truly learned, as those who through the knowledge of Christ have been made apt for the kingdom of heaven and eternal salvation.—Subtle idolatry is not better than gross idolatry.

BENGEL:—The lamentable state of the world is most aptly described in the brief summary: "*The whole world lieth in the wicked one,*" and the world itself, the doings and workings of the children of the world, their sayings, their dealings, their society, etc., are the best exposition of this passage. It is not so much matter of surprise that they are so wicked, as that they are not more wicked.—

HEUBNER:—A sin is not excusable, because it is not yet a sin unto death. A pardonable sin may become a sin unto death; therefore we should abhor every sin.—The wicked one will not touch him: 1. The power of Satan is not irresistible; 2. The Christian, while he continues in a state of regeneration, is proof against all the assaults of Satan.—Fine threads are often more dangerous than coarse chains.—*Faith in the Son of God.* I. A holy, blissful, assured faith:—*a.* as to its substance: in the Image of God, in the Saviour of love; *b.* as to its ground: in the testimony of God; *c.* as to its effects: eternal life. II. It is a faith possible unto all: *a.* provided they diligently read and lay to heart what is written, in order to attain unto faith; *b.* provided they pray God with child-like trust, to give unto them the true faith.—

BESSER:—A singular saying! They believe, and he writes that they may believe. What need is there of an exhortation to believe, if we believe already? (Luther). It is not possible to have to-day's life through yesterday's faith. Here no stand-still is allowed; he that believes, let him go on believing.—After every prayer of a child of God, the Father hears the expressed or unexpressed petition: Thy will be done.—I have read of a pious Christian who was in the habit of keeping a record of his daily prayers and intercessions that he invariably concluded his daily record with the passage 1 Jno. v. 15.—Sin is to the children of God like a robber, against whom they defend themselves all their life long. As a sentry stands before a king's palace, so there stands a sentry with shield and sword before the habitation of God in the heart of His children.—The Epistle of St. John itself is such a preservative.

[EZEKIEL HOPKINS:—God's will, in bestowing a desired mercy upon us, is best known by the promises that He hath made to us. Which promises are of two kinds: some refer to temporal blessings, and others refer to grace and glory.

1. Grace and glory are promised *absolutely.* It is that, which we are commanded, all of us, to seek after: and, therefore, here we cannot mistake, while we beg these; for there is no doubt while we pray for grace and glory, but that we do it according to the will of God. Here, we may be earnest and importunate, that God would sanctify and save our souls: and, while we ask this, and make this the matter of our requests, we are under an impossibility of asking amiss; yea, and the more violent we are, and the more resolute to take no denial at the hands of God, the more pleasing is this holy force, since it shows a perfect conformity and concurrence in our wills to His will, who hath told us, It is His will, "*even,*" our "*sanctification:*" 1 Thess. iv. 3. This was one part of that violence which our Saviour saith the kingdom of heaven suffered in the days of John the Baptist. It is an invasion that is acceptable to God, when we storm heaven by prayers and supplications, with strong cries and tears: when we plant against it unutterable sighs and groans, this is such a battery, that those eternal ramparts cannot hold out long against it.

2. Though we may pray thus absolutely and with a holy boldness, for grace and glory, saying to God as Jacob to the angel that wrestled with him, I will not let thee go, until thou hast blessed me with spiritual blessings, in heavenly things, in Jesus Christ: yet, secondly, for the degrees of grace and for the comforts of the Holy Ghost, we must pray *conditionally*: if the Lord will. For

these things are not absolutely necessary, neither are they absolutely promised to us by God. Neither any degree of grace, nor any consolation of the Spirit is absolutely promised to us. But, however, our prayers ought to be so much the more fervent and importunate for these things, than for outward, temporal things; by how much more these are of far greater concern than the other.

3. To pray for outward and worldly blessings is *not contrary* to the will of God, for He hath promised to bestow them.—But then, as His promise is conditional, if it is consistent with our good: so, truly, must our prayers be conditional, that God would give them to us, if it is consistent with His will and with our good. Whatsoever we thus ask, we do it according to the will of God; and we are sure of speeding in our request, either by obtaining our desires, or by being blessed with a denial. For, alas, we are blind and ignorant creatures, and cannot look into the designs and drift of Providence, and see how God hath laid in order good and evil in His own purpose: oftentimes, we mistake evil for good, because of the present appearance of good that it hath; yea, so short-sighted are we, that we can look no farther than outward and present appearance. But God, who sees the whole series and connection of his own counsels, knows, many times, that those things, which we account and desire as good, are really evil: and therefore it is our wisdom, to resign all our desires to His disposal, and to say, "Lord, though such temporal enjoyments may seem good and desirable to me at present, yet Thou art infinitely wise, and Thou knowest what the consequence and issue of them will be: I beg them, if they may stand with Thy will; and if Thou seest they will be as really good to me, as I suppose them now to be. If they be not so, I beg the favour of a denial." This is the right frame, in which a Christian's heart should be when he comes to beg temporal mercies of God; and, whilst he thus asks any worldly comforts, he cannot ask amiss. It was an excellent saying of the Satirist, "We ask those things of God which please our present humors and desires: but God gives those things which are best and fittest for us: for we are dearer to Him," saith the heathen, "than we are to ourselves." "And," says another, very well, "It is mercy in God, not to hear us, when we ask things that are evil:" and when He refuseth us in such requests, it is that He might not circumvent us in our own prayers; for, indeed, whilst we ask rashly and intemperately, whatever we foolishly set our hearts upon, God need take no other course to plague and punish us, than by hearing and answering us."—M.].

[Bp. Hall: v. 16:—"If any man see his brother fall into and continue in such a sin as may be capable of forgiveness, let him earnestly sue unto God for pardon of that offender: and God, who is great and infinite in mercy, shall graciously incline His ear unto his prayers, and give remission and life to such an one. There is indeed a sin unto death, for which there is no forgiveness with God, because there is no capacity of repentance for it in the committer of it; I mean the Sin against the Holy Ghost; when a man having received the knowledge of the Gospel by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, and professed the belief thereof, shall in a devilish malice wilfully blaspheme and persecute that known truth."—M.].

[Jortin:—"What makes sin exceedingly sinful and most provoking, is a determined insolence and an obstinate impenitency, a guilt without remorse, and without relenting, without shame and without fear. This is what appears most odious and offensive in the sight of God, as also in the sight of man; and to this incorrigible temper, and abandoned behaviour, indignation and wrath are denounced by Him, who will by no means acquit those that are guilty in this way. "There is a sin unto death," saith St. John, "and there is a sin not unto death." The sin unto death, of which the Apostle speaks, was in some manner peculiar to those times. It was an apostasy from Christianity, and these apostates were persons who had seen the miraculous proofs of its truth, and had themselves been partakers of some extraordinary gifts. When such persons renounced Christ, and fell away from the Church, it was plain that nothing more could be done to amend and reclaim them. And even now it is possible, that sinners may offend so long and so heinously as at last to provoke God, either to take them out of the world by a secret judgment, and so it is a sin unto temporal death; or to give them up to their own hard hearts, and so it becomes a sin unto spiritual death. But let an observation be added, which may be necessary to quiet melancholy and desponding minds; and it is this: If any one be afraid that he is in such a condition, this very fear shows that in all probability he is not in such a condition; because it is usual for such sinners to have no consideration, no shame, no remorse, and no fear at all."—M.].

[Ezekiel Hopkins:—"Beware therefore, then, that you do not entertain any slight thought of sin: nor think, with the Papists, that there are some sorts of sins, that do not deserve death; which they call *venial* sins, in opposition to other more gross and heinous sins, which they allow to be *mortal*. Believe it, the least prick at the heart is deadly; and so is the least sin to the soul. And, indeed, it is a contradiction, to call any sin venial in their sense, who hold it is not worthy of damnation, for *the wages of sin is death;* if it be not, how is it venial?"—M.].

[Rieger: on v. 21:—"Those who were called to the light of God, readily knew that an *idol* is nothing in the world, and that idolatry and idol-worship are abominable. But there were at that time temptations which did not render superfluous this concluding admonition. They might be invited to idol-sacrifices and thus be drawn into a sort of communion with idols, Rev. ii. 20; 2 Cor. vi. 16. Sometimes, in order to escape bitter persecution, Christians might venture to go too far. Yes, notwithstanding idols have at this present time sunk into still greater contempt, there yet arises always something which injuriously affects the knowledge of God in Christ Jesus, or the worship of God in spirit and in truth, which tries to find out some other way to God than by Christ, and to seek acceptance with God in another service than in His Son. It becomes therefore every one who is of the truth to sigh, O God, keep me in the mind,

which Thou hast given me of Thy Son, and in which thou hast strengthened me by this testimony of St. John! Amen."—M].

[*Sermons and Sermon Themes.*

Ver. 13. If we must aim at assurance, what should they do who are not able to discern their own spiritual condition? THOMAS DOOLITTLE. Morn. Exerc. I. 252.

Ver. 16. LIGHTFOOT, JOHN. A sin unto death. Sermons; Works, 6, 331.

CHALMERS, T. The nature of the sin unto death. Sermon: Works, 9, 225.

VVer. 16, 17. BENSON, G. Concerning a sin unto death, and a sin not unto death. A Paraphrase, etc. 2, 647.—M.].

THE

SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES GENERAL OF JOHN.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLES.

1. The Second Epistle, after the Address and Salutation (vv. 1–3), expresses the Apostle's joy on finding the children of the *κυρία* walk in the truth of the Gospel (v. 4), a monition of the commandment of brotherly love (vv. 5, 6), not without a solemn warning against the doctrine of the false teachers, who confess not the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh (vv. 7–9), and against fellowship with them (vv. 10, 11). Disinclined to write, and in the hope of early oral intercourse, the Epistle concludes with greetings of the sister's children (vv. 12, 13).

2. The Third Epistle, addressed to Caius (v. 1), after a salutation, importing his wish for the prosperity of Caius, expresses the Apostle's joy over his walking in the truth (vv. 2–4), commends his hospitality to missionary brethren (vv. 5–8), deplores the opposition they have to encounter at the hands of the ambitious Diotrephes, notwithstanding his Epistle of commendation, and the readiness of the Church to comply therewith, with an intimation of his intention to take a personal stand against him (vv. 9, 10), warns against his example and commends Demetrius, the probable bearer of the Epistle (vv. 11, 12). Disinclined to write, and in the hope of a speedy meeting, the Epistle concludes with greetings from the Apostle and friends to friends (vv. 13–15).

§ 2. CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLES.

1. These two brief Epistles, besides which reference is made to a similar Epistle, which has been lost (3 Jno. 9), are two instructive monuments of the Apostle's mode of dealing with individuals. Ewald justly observes that these Epistles lack the rich flow and fusion of language found in a similar Epistle addressed by Paul to Philemon, but unmistakeably evince a loftier assurance, and with all their gentleness and affability, a brevity and earnestness which point to an Apostle little disposed to write much, and greatly preferring oral dealings and instruction.

2. While the Second Epistle exhibits in forcible energy the most lively joy in his converts' walking in the truth coupled with the most tender solicitude for them with respect to the false teachers, and warns them in the most decided terms against intimate intercourse with them, the Third Epistle exhibits the same joy, coupled with a reference to the aiding sympathy with missionary brethren as the inviolable duty of individuals and the Church, and censures, threatens and entreats with great power.

3. The two Epistles exhibit a remarkable similarity. The beginning of 2 Jno. 1 is precisely like that of 3 Jno. 1 (*ὁ πρεσβύτερος—ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*); 2 Jno. 4 and 3 John 3 (*ἐχάρην λίαν*); particularly the conclusion 2 Jno. 12 (*πολλὰ ἔχων—οὐκ ἐβουλήθην διὰ χάρτου καὶ μέλανος —ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω —στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλῆσαι*), and 3 Jno. 13, 14 (*πολλὰ εἶχον—οὐ θέλω διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμου—ἐλπίζω δὲ—στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλήσομεν*).—These Epistles, which resemble each other like twin sisters

(Düsterdieck after Hieronymus, *Ep.* 85), must have been written by one and the same author. This is the opinion of those who ascribe their authorship to the Apostle St. John, of Ebrard, who ascribes them to the Presbyter John, and of Baur, who regards them as writings of Montanistic origin.

§ 3. OCCASION AND SCOPE OF THE EPISTLES.

1. Although similar in plan and form, they are different as to their objects and tendency.—From his acquaintance with some of the children of the κυρία, who were stanch Christians, the author of the Second Epistle took occasion to express his joy to their mother, who, as Düsterdieck, and probably correctly, supposes, had been known and endeared to him for some time, and to make known to her his paternal sympathy and encouragement, coupled, in particular, with a warning against false teachers and fellowship with them, who might prove especially dangerous to a Christian lady, for the purpose that her joy might be full (v. 12) and remain undisturbed; the announcement of his visit does not seem to belong to the real scope of the Epistle, (Düsterdieck).—The Author of the Third Epistle has been informed by missionary brethren that owing to the ambitious and domineering attitude of Diotrephes, who had also maligned the author of the Epistle for his interest on behalf of said missionaries, these had not been permanently received in the Church, with which Caius was connected, and had been compelled to move on, notwithstanding the hospitality of Caius and several other church-members similarly disposed. On this account the author of the Epistle gives notice of his coming in a short time, with a view to removing such disunion and disorder and to encouraging Caius to fearless care of the brethren.

2. In view of these simple, unequivocal relations, Baur, the head of the Tübingen School, describes the situation in a truly marvellous manner, with shocking arbitrariness. On the ground of the passage from Clement of Alexandria, cited below in § 5, Baur maintains that ἐκλεκτή is the Church, which is holy, and that the Montanists portray the *ecclesia* or *Sponsa Christi vera, pudica, sancta;* that the allegorical term *Babylonia* refers to Rome, as in 1 Peter v. 13; that opinions were divided in respect of Montanism; that one party led by Diotrephes, had denied church-fellowship to the Church with which the author of the Epistle was connected, but that the other party was on terms of amity and union with said Church, that this second Epistle was addressed to the *Montanistic* party of the Church at *Rome;* that *Diotrephes* is not a real name, but a symbolical designation of the Roman bishop, yet not of Victor (193-202), as assumed by Schwegler (*Montanism* p. 284), because Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria were already acquainted with these Epistles, but perhaps of Anicetus (157–168), Soter or Eleutheros (to 193); that due consideration should be given to the *partisan spirit* of the author of the Epistle, which made him designate the followers of Diotrephes as heathens (3 Jno. 7); that the Second Epistle was addressed to the Church to which Caius belonged, and that the Epistle, alluded to at 3 Jno. 9, was written to Caius.—Baur bases all this on the notice of Clement of Alexandria that the Second Epistle was written by the Apostle St. John, and Diotrephes (Διοτρεφής), one nourished and brought up by Jews, is said to be the symbolical designation of an orthodox bishop at Rome. A Montanist is named as the author of these Epistles, which contain no Montanistic views and are not even referred to by Tertullian, the Montanist!—Hilgenfeld regards the Second Epistle as an excommunicatory writing, designed to be the official expression of an Apostolical sentence of repudiation directed against fellowship with the Gnostic false teachers, and the Third Epistle as an ἐπιστολὴ συστατική emanating from the Church of John, for the purpose of vindicating the right of that Church to issue such Epistles of commendation, which the Jewish Christians considered to be the prerogative of their venerated James, the author of the Epistle having recognized the utility of such an ordered passport-system during the Gnostic storms and commotions; cf. Huther, p. 253, sqq.

§ 4. READERS OF THE EPISTLES.

On the κυρία see notes on 2 Jno. 1, and on Caius, notes on 3 Jno. 1 in Exegetical and Critical.—Very curious is the view of Ewald, who supposes that the two Epistles were sent to one Church, namely, the Second Epistle addressed to the *elect glorious one*, to the Church; but because

it might be feared that Diotrephes the elder, through whose hands the Epistle had to pass, would prevent its being publicly read at Church, the Third Epistle was on that account addressed to another well-disposed elder, viz., Caius, of the same Church. The poor support which this view derives from 3 Jno. 9 is evident and shown in the Exegesis on that passage. He further alleges that the great stress of the times induced John to omit the name of the Church, which must have been one of considerable importance, because three of its elders, viz., Diotrephes, Caius, Demetrius, are mentioned. Pure conjectures!

§ 5. THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLES.

1. *History* answers the question, 'Who is the author of these Epistles?' in the following particulars: The oldest testimony for these Epistles is that of the Muratorian Canon of the New Testament which was composed until about A. D. 170 (as stated in the Introduction to the first Epistle § 3, 1. p. 4.), and makes mention of the First and Second Epistles. From the excellent essay of Wieseler, referred to there, we have still to supply an observation on the Pauline Epistles to Philemon, Titus and Timothy. In said Canon we read (p. 828): ***Verum ad Philemonem una, et ad Timotheum duæ pro affectu et dilectione, in honorem tamen ecclesiæ catholicæ, in ordinatione ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ sanctificatæ sunt.***—"The Epistle to Philemon probably followed immediately after the Epistles addressed to Churches, because it was addressed not only to Philemon, but also to Apphia and Archippus and to the Church in Philemon's house (v. 2), and because the Apostolical salutation and benediction had also reference to them (vv. 3, 25). It constituted, therefore, a sort of transition to the Epistles addressed to individuals only, viz., to those to Titus and Timothy. Yet the circumstance, that such a distinction was really drawn in the Christian Church between Epistles addressed to individuals, and Epistles addressed to whole Churches, and that our author deemed it necessary, in the words beginning with ***pro affectu et dilectione***, to justify the grounds on which the Epistles to Titus and Timothy were notwithstanding received into the Ecclesiastical Canon,—has a most important bearing on the history of the Canon." (Wieseler, l. c. p. 839). Hence it can neither be thought singular, nor subject to doubt, that, while the Second Epistle, because of its more instructive character and because the term *κυρία* was supposed to refer to a Church and not to an individual person, was received along with the First Epistle into the Canon, the Third Epistle, addressed to an unknown personage and without the intrinsic weight of the Pauline Pastoral Epistles, was not received into the Canon; but this of course does not deny its Johannean origin, still this is the way how it came to be reckoned among the Antilegomena. The additional clause: ***"ut sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta,"*** does not belong to the words preceding them which refer to the Epistle of John, but to those following: ***"apocalypsis etiam Johannis."*** The latter, therefore, is said to have been composed by the friend of John, not by himself, but this is not asserted concerning the Epistles, as many, because of the false connection with the words preceding said clause, would like to maintain (Wieseler, l. c. p. 846 sq.). Hence Düsterdieck's use of the Muratorian Canon (II. p. 464 sq.), and also Huther's (p. 248 sq.), require to be rectified in this respect.—Clement of Alexandria, the successor of Pantænus A. D. 190–220: ***"Secunda Johannis epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta est, simplicissima est; scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine, significat autem electionem ecclesiæ sanctæ."*** (Opp. ed. Potter p. 1011). Origen, who says in his eighth homily on Joshua: ***"addit et Joannes tuba canere per*** EPISTOLAS ***suas,"*** knew several Epistles; but he says according to Euseb. ***Hist. Eccl.***, VI. 25: *οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας.*—Dionysius of Alexander, the disciple and successor of Origen A. D. 233, from A. D. 248 bishop, for the purpose of illustrating the Johannean diction makes use also of the Second and Third Epistles, takes accordingly no offence in the appellation: *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*, and calling the Second and Third Epistles *φερομένη* *Ἰωάννου*, designated them as generally received as Johannean, by tradition.—Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp and Papias, † A. D. 202, cites 2 Jno. 7 mistakenly, as Guericke says (p. 478), owing to an error of memory, as forming part of the First Epistle (*adv. Hær.* III. 16. 8), but still as from the Epistles of John; he cites, however, correctly 2 Jno. 11 (adv. Hær. I. 163), as from the Epistle of John (*Ἰωάννης δὲ, ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητής.*)—It is of course natural, that these two private Epistles were not translated in the earliest age of the Church, and consequently not inserted in the Peschito,

which contains only three Catholic Epistles (James, 1 Peter, 1 John), although Ephrem the Syrian knew both Epistles,—and that citations from them are more rare occurrences, so that Tertullian and Cyprian do not make mention of them. Although Cyprian did not cite them in his own writings, he still says in relating (*De Hær. bapt.*) the opinions of the various bishops in the council of Carthage: *"Aurelius a Chullabi dixit: Joannes Apostolus in epistola sua posuit dicens, si quis ad vos venit,"* etc. 2 Jno. 10; [thus clearly showing that this Epistle was received as Apostolical and Canonical in the North African Church.—M.]. On that account Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* III. 25) reckons the two Epistles among the antilegomena of the first class [still Eusebius's own opinion may be gathered from his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, III. 5, where he says of St. John ἐν μὲν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ μνήμην τῆς οἰκείας προσηγορίας ποιεῖται, ἢ πρεσβύτερον ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζει, οὐδαμοῦ δὲ ἀποστόλον οὐδὲ εὐαγγελιστήν, whence it would appear that he received the two smaller Epistles as genuine." Alford.—M.]. Jerome (*de vir. illustr.* c. 9): *"Scripsit autem Johannes et unam epistolam—quæ ab universis ecclesiasticis et eruditis Viris probatur: reliquæ autem duæ quarum principium* SENIOR *Johannis Presbyteri asseruntur."* But he calls (cap. 18) this view *"opinio, quam a plerisque retulimus traditam,"* and Oecumenius and Bede decidedly reject this view.—The Epistles, after having been regarded without any doubt as Johannean in the Middle Ages, were first referred to the authorship of John the Presbyter by Erasmus, who was followed by Grotius, J. D. Beck (*observ. crit. exeget. specim.* I.), Fritzsche (*Observations on the Epistles of John* in Henke's *Museum*, vol. 3, 1), Ammon (*Life of Jesus* I. p. 45 sq.), and especially Ebrard. Almost all the modern commentators (Lücke, de Wette, Brückner, Düsterdieck, Huther) receive them as Johannean Epistles. The Tübingen school disputes their Apostolical origin and considers them, according to the opinion of its leader, as writings of *Montanistic* origin; but Hilgenfeld, at least, makes them originate in the *subapostolic age* (cf. § 3).

2. The result of the examination of the most ancient documents respecting the author of these two Epistles, which requires us to regard them as the writings of the Apostle St. John, is confirmed by the writings themselves.—The *first* point to be considered here is the term ὁ πρεσβύτερος. Here the author observes an incognito to all persons except those to whom he wrote, and who knew, of course, who this presbyter was. It surely was not his intention to write anonymously, because he addresses private individuals in clear and definite terms, and apprizes them of his coming to see them. The expression in question describes a superior position in general terms and in language reflecting a friendly and affectionate disposition. This is precisely St. John's manner both in the First Epistle and in the Gospel; he thus describes himself, that only those whom it concerns, may recognize him. Bede and Oecumenius leave it undecided whether the Apostle called himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος on account of his age or on account of his office; had he used said appellation on account of his advanced years, he ought to have put either ὁ πρεσβύτης, or ὁ γέρων. Hence Piscator, Er., Schmidt, Wolf, Carpzov, Sander and al., [who take this view—M.], are mistaken. The official sense of that appellation is advocated by N. de Lyra, Bartholomæus Petrus (=*Episcopus, totius Asiæ primus*), a Lapide, Beza, Lücke, Huther, Düsterdieck and others. Cf. 1 Pet. v. 1: συμπρεσβύτερος, and Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, III., 39, where the Apostles are called πρεσβύτεροι. John might have called himself ὁ ἀπόστολος, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος; but he prefers thus to moderate his privileged position. Ewald assumes that it was also on account of the stress of the times that he omitted to give his own name, as well as that of the Church to which he sent the second Epistle (see above in § 4). Düsterdieck combines the official reference of this appellation with a reference to age, the then advanced years of the Apostle presupposing the years during which he had held converse with the Lord Himself; so also Aretius, Guericke, (*Gesammtgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, 1854, p. 485, sq.), Benson and others. But seeing that there did exist, according to the testimony of Papias in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, III., 39, a person different from the Apostle, called John the Presbyter, who was called ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου, it has been thought, especially on the above-cited testimony of Irenæus, that this latter was the author of these Epistles. This opinion is strenuously advocated by Ebrard. But in that case the name ought not to be wanting, as Lücke, Düsterdieck and Huther, rightly and emphatically contend; for it cannot be proved that said personage bore that name κατ' ἐξοχήν, especially since

the diction of the Epistles clearly points to the Apostle.—The *second* point relates to the impress of Johannean diction and thought left on our Epistles. Compare only the following expressions: 2 Jno. 1: *ἐγνωκότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, v. 2: *μένειν ἐν*, v. 3: *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ*, v. 4: *περιπατεῖν ἐν*, v. 5: *ἐντολὴν—καινὴ, ἣν εἴχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* (1 Jno. ii. 7), v. 6: *αὕτη—ἵνα* (1 Jno. iii. 11, 23; v. 3), *καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, v. 7: *πλάνοι ἐξῆλθον* (1 Jno. ii. 18, sq.), *οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί* (1 Jno. iv. 1, 2), *ὁ ἀντίχριστος*, v. 9: *μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ, θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει* (1 Jno. ii. 23), *καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει*, v. 12: *ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη* (1 Jno. i. 4), 3 Jno. 1: *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*, vv. 3, 4, *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ περιπατεῖς*, v. 11: *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν, οὐχ ἑώρακεν τὸν θεὸν* (1 Jno. iii. 6, 10; iv. 8). The connection of thesis and antithesis, without simple antithesis, leading to a progression in the thought, occurs at 2 Jno. 9; 3 Jno. 11. How freely is carried out the theme of 2 Jno. 3: *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ*, and then vv. 4–11. Do we not identify the independent position of the author by the *ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί* (2 Jno. 7), as compared with the Perfect (1 Jno. iv. 2), and the Aorist (1 Jno. v. 6), and his free, easy handling of his subject. This independence is recognizable in the salutation, perfectly analogous to that in the pastoral Epistles of Paul, by the *ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν* being placed first, and then by the *παρά* following, instead of which Paul uses *ἀπὸ* (see note on the passage), and the omission of *ἡμῶν*, supplied by Paul. On this, as well as on the severity, alleged to be bordering on lovelessness in 2 Jno. 10, compare the notes below, in Exegetical and Critical.—After what has been said, we can neither refer, with de Wette, to *εἴ τις* (2 Jno. 10) instead of *ἐάν τις*, *διδαχὴν φέρειν* (*ibid.*), *περιπατεῖν κατὰ* (v. 6), *κοινωνεῖν* (v. 11), *μειζότερος* (3 Jno. 4), *τὸ κακόν, τὸ ἀγαθὸν*, as proofs against the Johannean origin of the Epistle, nor characterize, with the same intent, with Fritzsche, as Pauline the following expressions: *ὑγιαίνειν, εὐοδοῦσθαι* (3 Jno. 2), *προπέμπειν ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ* (v. 6), *φιλοπρωτεύειν* (v. 9), *φλυαρεῖν* (v. 10), especially since the expressions used in 3 Jno. 6, 9, 10, are not found either in the writings of Paul. It is moreover rather hazardous to prove such things from single and isolated words, especially here, since the matters introduced in the Third Epistle are altogether specific, and do not bear the faintest resemblance to the circumstances, relations and subjects discussed in the First Epistle; such a disparity, of course, involves the use of different expressions. Ebrard's attempt also, to prove that the Third Epistle, as being most unlike the First, and the Second Epistle nearly related to the Third, were not written by the Apostle St. John, but by John the Presbyter, is a failure. He discovers in the passages used, allusions, intentional reminiscences, and actually citations, and acknowledges the Author's independence neither in the passages given above, nor "in the striking circumstance" that he uses at 2 Jno. 10, *εἴ τις* instead of *ἐάν τις*, and that "at 3 Jno. 11 he reproduces Johannean *forms of thought*, in wholly unjohannean *language*." Even Ebrard is compelled to admit the similarity of the Second Epistle to the First, both as to the identity of the doctrine taught, and the form of its expression.—Under these circumstances it seems impossible to deny the Apostolic and Johannean origin of these Epistles. They were both written by one and the same author, by an independent man, and the Second Epistle necessitates us to go back to the author of the First, while there is at least nothing in the Third to prevent such a mode of procedure.

§ 6. DATE OF THE EPISTLES.

One thing is clear: the two Epistles were written at about the same time. It cannot be inferred from the affinity of the Second Epistle with the First, that the former was composed after the latter, as Ebrard alleges, since only the identity of the Authors is established, but not the use of the First in the Second. Nor can any inferences be drawn from the First Epistle not being mentioned (S. G. Lange), from the more vigorous spirit of the Second Epistle (Eichhorn), from the youthful fire in the *rigoristic* saying at 2 Jno. 10, 11. (Knauer).—But they were probably written about the same time as the First, since the circumstances of the times are probably identical in all three Epistles.

§ 7. PLACE WHERE THEY WERE WRITTEN.

Probability points to Ephesus, as the place where they were written, before a tour of visitation (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., III., 23; Lücke, Huther, Düsterdieck).

§ 8. LITERATURE.

See Introduction to the first Epistle. § 10. Also the following:

J. SOMMELIUS, *Isagoge in 2 et 3 Joh. Ep.* Land. 1798.

J. RAMBONNET, *De sec. ep. Johannea*, Traj. 1818.

C. A. HEUMANN, *Commentar über den dritten Brief des Johannes*, Helmstädt. 1778.

[AUGUSTINE MARLORATE, 4to. 1588.

WILLIAM JONES, on the Second and Third Epistles of John, in the *Commentary on Philemon, etc.* Folio. London, 1635.

SAMUEL SMITH, *Exposition of the Second Epistle of St. John.* 1663.

F. D. MAURICE, on the 2d and 3d Epistles of St. John. Truth in the woman and the man. Epistles of St. John, 316.

J. B. CARPZOVIUS, *Commentatio in Epistolam, 2 Joannis de charitate et veritate; in Joannis Epistolam tertiam brevis enarratio.* T. Rapolti Opera. 4to. Lips. 1693.—M.]

COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF JOHN THE APOSTLE.

(*Ἰωάννου β*. B. Cod. Sin. Several codices add *ἐπιστολή*, and others *ἐπιστολὴ καθολική*. Several have after *Ἰωάννου*: *τοῦ ἐπὶ στηθοῦς*, G: *τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου—τοῦ θεολόγου*).

I. THE ADDRESS (vv. 1–3).

The elder unto the elect lady and her children, whom I love in the truth;[1] and[2] not I only, but also all they that have known the truth; for the truth's sake, which dwelleth in us,[3] and shall be with us for ever. Grace be[4] with you,[5] mercy, and *peace* from God the Father, and from[6] the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love.

Verse 1. [[1] German: "Whom I love in truth." So Alford, Lillie.—M.].
[2] B. Cod. Sin.: καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ; A.; οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ; G: καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ. [The reading of A. may have arisen from a desire to mark the antithesis more strongly.—M.]

Verse 2. [3] μένουσαν is the reading of B. Sin. and most and the best codd. A. reads ἐνοικοῦσαν, but is evidently an interpretation. [German: "which abideth in us."—M.]

Verse 3. [[4] German: "There shall be with you."—M.]
[5] A. omits ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν—evidently by a mistake, occasioned by the conclusion of v. 2. B. G. Sin. read ἡμῶν which is also occasioned by v. 2.
[6] G. K. Sin. insert before Ἰησοῦ the word κυρίου; this addition, as well as the exchange of the preposition παρὰ for ἀπὸ are probably transcribed from the beginnings of the Pauline Epistles.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The address proper. V. 1. **The elder,** *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*; the definite Article notes a person, the word without the Article would give prominence to his official position. That John the Apostle is meant we have endeavoured to prove in the Introduction § 5. Thus Peter also calls himself, in an exhortation addressed to presbyters, *συμπρεσβύτερος*. (1 Pet. v. 1).

To the elect lady, *ἐκλεκτῃ κυρίᾳ*; these words have been very differently explained. Grammatically they present a perfect analogy to 1 Pet. i. 1: *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις*, to elect strangers; *κυρίᾳ* therefore cannot well be taken as a proper name, which would require as at v. 13, and 3 Jno. 1: *Γαΐῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ,—κυρίᾳ τῇ ἐκλεκτῇ* Cf. Phil. i. 2. Rom. xvi. 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13 etc. To what purpose is it that *κυρία* was a female proper name, as may be seen in *Gruteri inscript.* p. 1127. N. xi., and that this was maintained by Athanasius, and later by Benson, Heumann, Bengel, Krigele (*de κυρία Joannis*, Lips. 1758). S. G. Lange, Carpzovius, Paulus, de Wette, Brückner, Lücke, Düsterdieck and others? Düsterdieck and Lücke notice a certain irregularity and inconsequence, which is not explained by but consists in the adjective preceding the noun, as long as *κυρία* is treated as a *nomen proprium.* But the difficulty is even greater in treating *ἐκλεκτή* as a proper name, as is done by de Lyra, Cappellus, Wetstein, Grotius and al. For the sister, v. 13, is also called *ἐκλεκτή*.—But how are we to take the *elect lady*? The context requires us to think of an individual: the *ἐγὼ* of the writer answers to the *σύ* of the person addressed (vv. 1, 4 sq.); she as a mother with her children is mentioned (vv. 3, 6, 8, 10, 12); her sister and her sister's children salute her (v. 13). Epictetus (cap. 62) observes that: *αἱ γυναῖκες εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα ἐτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν κυρίαι καλοῦνται.* Huther is wrong in saying that the term *κυρία* does not answer to the German *Frau* [=the English *Mistress*, the word used to address married ladies—M.], but to the German *Herrin* [= the English Mistress or lady of the house—M.]; for *Frau* is the feminine of *fro*, the Master, (*Frohndienst, Frohnveste, Fronleichnam*), and *Frau* =*Herrin* (see Jütting, *Biblisches Wörterbuch* 1864, s. v. *Frauenzimmer* p. 61 and s. v. *Frohnvogt* p. 65); nor need that author designate *κυρία* only as *a polite form of address*, nor Düsterdieck pronounce it a *title* only suited to *worldly politeness.* It may just as well be taken as the standing designation of an esteemed woman, and it is neither unworthy of a Christian, nor of an Apostle to call a church-member, according to a prevailing usage, "*Frau*" (lady or mistress)=*κυρία*, so

Luther, Piscator, Beza, Heidegger, Rittmeier, *de electa domina*, Helmst. 1706), Wolf, Baumgarten-Crusius, Sander and al.; a Lapide reports her to have been called Drusia or Drusiana. Carpzovius supposes that Martha, the sister of Lazarus, is the person addressed; Knauer (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1838, pp. 452–458), suggests Mary, the mother of the Lord—but all these views are wholly untenable. It is true, that unfortunately the name of the person addressed is not given in the address, so that one might almost feel inclined to take κυρία as a proper name. But the name of the person addressed might be wanting just as well as that of the writer; the messenger may and probably did make up for such omission.—But the circumstance that this "note" (*Handbillet*-Augusti) found its way among the Catholic Epistles, should not occasion any difficulty. Just as well as the third Epistle to Caius; it is no more unworthy of the Canon than St. Paul's Epistle to Philemon; the individual, also a woman, is worthy of due regard and consideration; I confine myself to making mention of Priscilla (Acts xviii. 2, sq.; 26, sq.; Rom. xvi. 3, sq.).—It is far more hazardous to understand κυρία to signify the Christian Church in general, or some particular congregation; the former is recommended by Jerome, the latter by the Scholiast I.; they are followed by Calov, Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung* II., p. 321; *Schriftbeweis*, I., p. 226, sq.), Hilgenfeld, Huther and al. Serrarius guessed Corinth, Whiston argued for Philadelphia, Whitby for Jerusalem, the mother of all Churches, and Augusti for Jerusalem, because founded by the Lord Himself, though such a "*note*" would certainly be less suited to a Church than to an individual church-member. Hammond has the curious notion that κυρία is=*curia*, *ecclesia*, and Michaelis, that it designates the Church assembled on the Lord's day. But wholly unfounded, and devoid of all possibility of proof is the hypothesis of Besser and al., that κυρία is the ἐκκλησία to which 3 Jno. 9, was written, and that the 2d Epistle of John is the one there referred to. Hofmann adverts to the Church being called νύμφη and γυνή in the Apocalypse, to שׁוּלַמִּית and שְׁלֹמֹה, and to ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή (1 Pet. v. 13). Huther also rightly observes in opposition to Ebrard, that the Church, which in respect of Christ is an obedient handmaid, may be considered both in her subordinate relation to Christ and in her superior relation to individual members, and as such be described as κυρία by the side of κύριος; but that v. 12 requires us to understand a single congregation and not "*all orthodox Christendom*" (Hilgenfeld), and that our Epistle is not an Encyclical. But in that case the address ought to have given the name of that congregation. Nor would ἐκλεκτή exactly suit κυρία=ἐκκλησία; for ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή is somewhat different, and, in juxtaposition with and as distinguished from ὁ Μάρκος, can hardly designate the Church in that place (see Fronmüller on 1 Pet. v. 13, in this Commentary). The relation indicated at Gal. iv. 26: ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν, can hardly have been applied here to a single congregation, so that it might be called κυρία. After all that has been said, the choice lies between κυρία as a *nomen proprium*, or κυρία=lady. [Among recent English commentators, Alford takes the former view, while Wordsworth elaborates the interpretation, according to which κυρία is a Church.—M.].

And her children (τοῖς τέκνοις) should be taken literally; a family is always an important circle of men! But if κυρία is construed as a Church, the children designate Church-members.

Further particulars. vv. 1, 2.

Whom I love in truth.—Οὓς after τέκνα imports sons, but does not exclude daughters, the κυρία had sons and daughters, but more sons than daughters; hence it would have been improper to say τοῖς υἱοῖς, as Huther maintains, who, if κυρία designates a Church, refers to Gal. iv. 9 (τεκνία μου—οὕς), Matth. xxviii. 19 (τὰ ἔθνη—αὐτούς), passages which fully justify the given explanation, and prove that τέκνα need not be sons only (de Wette and al.); nor does οὓς refer to κυρία and her children (Beza, Bengel, Sander [al.]). Ἐγώ emphatically asserts the Apostle's personal relations to that family-congregation; that which makes that family-congregation the object of the Apostle's love and of that of all believers, implies the reason of this Epistle and its importance. Though ἐν ἀληθείᾳ along with ἀγαπῶ should be construed adverbially, yet it signifies more than: "in sincerity," for it denotes also Christian love. Bengel: "*Amor non modo verus amor, sed veritate evangelica nititur.*" Lücke: "It designates genuine Christian love." Ebrard: "I love thee with that love which is love in truth," cf. i. Jno. iii. 18, 19. The additional clause has respect to objective truth (Düsterdieck, Huther 2d ed.).

And not I only, but also all who have known the truth.—Bengel pointedly observes: "*communio sanctorum.*" He assumes in his own case, as well as in the ἀγαπᾶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, the ἐγνωκέναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. The term πάντες must not be restricted to Ephesus and its environs, the supposed place of writing (Grotius, de Wette and al.), but only to those who were acquainted with the κυρία and her children (Lücke), yet so that those, who afterwards might get acquainted with her, are included. The restriction lies not in the word itself, but in the *situation* (Ebrard). It is not necessary to think here of only one Church (Huther).—The reason of this love is stated in

Ver. 2. **For the truth's sake, which abideth in us.**—Ἡμῖν designates the persons loving and beloved, (Huther); it must not be altogether construed in a general sense or applied, as if by implication, to the persons specified in v. 1 (Bede, Düsterdieck and al.). This is also the ground of the definition of ἀγαπᾶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ and of believers as οἱ ἐγνωκότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν (v. 1), not as Huther maintains, in πλάνοι (v. 7). The common life-sphere is just ἡ ἀλήθεια, and moreover not only that which is objectively sure, but also that which subjectively is securely kept. In order to note the former point, the Apostle adds:

And shall be with us forever.—The reason why the Participle, instead of being followed by a further participial sentence, is here followed

by the *Verb. finit.*, is the writer's intention to give greater prominence to this thought. Winer, p. 600. The Future is not the expression of a *wish*, as Grotius, Lücke, Ebrard and others suppose, but the confident assertion of certain duration. Hence εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα must not be restricted to the duration of the life of the persons interested (Benson and others). Μεθ' ἡμῶν denotes the objectivity of Divine truth as well as our subjectively developed activity. Cf. Jno. xiv. 16; 1 Jno. ii. 20, 27; especially Matth. xxviii. 20. Hence ἐν and μετὰ must not be taken as substantially equivalent (Winer, p. 430), since ἐν notes the subjective side, and μετὰ also the objective side.

The *greeting*. v. 3. **There shall be with you.**—Singular, and proof that we have not to deal here with the imitation of a forger; who would have adhered to usual and current forms of expression, like the addition ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ, here Future; it is qualified by the preceding words with which it is connected. It is not=ἔστω, but *votum cum affirmatione* (Bengel); the certainty of the expectation excels the wish of the greeting.

Grace, mercy, peace.—1. Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 21 have also χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη.—Χάρις is free grace, which, without any merit on the part of man, lovingly condescends to men and denotes the thoughts of peace in the paternal heart of God, the *mind* of Him who is Love (Rom. iii. 24; Eph. ii. 4–10); ἔλεος describes the mercy which energetically lays hold of, and enters into the *misery* of man (Luke x. 30–37), and denotes the *act* of love; εἰρήνη is the *gift* of love, the effect of χάρις and ἔλεος. [Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, p. 225: "Χάρις has reference to the sins of men, ἔλεος to their misery. God's χάρις, His free grace and gift, is extended to men, as they are guilty, His ἔλεος is extended to them, as they are miserable. The lower creation may be, and is, the object of God's ἔλεος, inasmuch as the burden of man's curse has redounded also upon it (Job. xxxviii. 41; Ps. cxlvii. 9; Jonah iv. 11), but of His χάρις man alone; he only needs, he only is capable of receiving it. In the Divine mind, and in the order of our salvation as conceived therein, the ἔλεος precedes the χάρις. God so *loved* the world with a pitying love (herein was the ἔλεος) that He *gave* His only-begotten Son (herein the χάρις) that the world through Him might be saved: cf. Eph. ii. 14; Luke i. 78, 79. But in the order of the manifestation of God's purposes of salvation the grace must go before the mercy, the χάρις must make way for the ἔλεος. It is true, that the same persons are the subjects of both, being at once the guilty and the miserable, yet the righteousness of God, which it is just as necessary should be maintained as His Love, demands that the guilt should be done away, before the misery can be assuaged; only the forgiven can, or indeed may, be made happy; whom He has pardoned, He heals; men are justified before they are sanctified. Thus in each of the Apostolic salutations it is first χάρις and then ἔλεος, which the Apostle desires for the faithful (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Gal. i. 3; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2, etc.); nor could the order of the words be reversed."—M.].—This might be wanting soonest, since the χάρις of the Almighty, of course, cannot remain idle; see Tit. i. 4; Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Gal. i. 3; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2; Col. i. 2; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 2. But it is just χάρις which is omitted in Jude 2 (ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη), since these two, with respect to εἰρήνη, belong together. But the order is established. Bengel observes very well: "GRATIA *tollit culpam*, MISERICORDIA *miseriam*, PAX *dicit permansionem in gratia est misericordia.*" [Alford: "Εἰρήνη is the whole sum and substance of the possession and enjoyment of God's grace and mercy; cf. Luke ii. 14; Rom. v. 1; x. 15; Jno. xiv. 27; xvi. 33."—M.].

From God the Father, and from Jesus Christ the Son of the Father.—The employment of παρὰ instead of the ἀπὸ commonly used in the Pauline writings, points to the independence of our author; and so does the circumstance that the pronoun ἡμῶν is omitted after πατρός. Thus, in this connection, God is to be taken primarily as the Father of Jesus Christ, especially since the words τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρός are annexed, and the Sonship is rendered peculiarly prominent, also since the preposition παρὰ is repeated, as denoting the Divine nature and character of the object desired by the Apostle, whereas ἀπὸ denotes only their procession from God; παρὰ designates them as the gifts *of God*, ἀπὸ as Divine *gifts*. Cf. Winer, 382 sq. Note should also be taken here of the independence of the Son by the side of the Father, as importing their equality.

In truth and love.—Also a peculiar addition; it belongs to ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν, the preposition ἐν denoting the two life-elements (Huther) of believers, in which the Divine exhibitions of grace, mercy and peace have to be received and enjoyed (Düsterdieck); these words contain also a reference to the contents of the Epistle (Bengel, Ebrard). Hence it is wrong to join ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ with τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς, as if it were=*filio verissimo et dilectissimo* (Barth. Petrus), or to explain *ut perseveretis vel ut crescatis* (a Lapide), or like Grotius: *per cognitionem veri et dilectionem mutuam, nam per haec in nos Dei beneficia provocamus, conservamus, augemus;* for ἐν is not= *per*, and *our* conduct is not the reason of the χάρις etc. (Huther).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. God is primarily the Father of Jesus Christ, and Christ the Son of God, and it is not until we are in Christ, that he is our Father, and we are His children.
2. By the side of the Personality of the Father the Personality of the Son is a fundamental view.
3. The grace of God is the ground of our peace.
4. Our peace is the end and aim of the Divine grace and mercy.
5. All true love rests upon the truth of revelation.
6. Love with its all-embracing power is coextensive with truth.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Love is truth, and truth is love!—Truth and love are the fundamental elements of the Chris-

tian life. Peace is really nothing but the health of the soul.

STARKE: In Christ there is neither male nor female.—Caution is needed, not to call any man elect, of whose true and firm faith we are not sufficiently convinced.—The abuse of titles should be abolished; but their right use should be preserved; honour to whom honour is due!—What! each and every person are not to be allowed to read the Holy Scriptures? and yet the Holy Spirit caused a special Epistle to be written to a pious matron and her children!—Preachers ought to pasture sheep and lambs, to teach great and small, in various ways, the ways of the Lord. —It is a rare example to meet a whole family of pious people.—A hireling loves the sheep for the sake of their fleece; but a true shepherd only for the truth's sake, because of God and with self-denial.—Truth is beautiful as such; but it is unprofitable, if it is not, and does not remain, in us.—Truth holds out longest.—Truth is founded on God, it has consequently an eternal root and will never perish. The greeting of Christians is a part of prayer.—None does truly receive peace, unless he have received the grace of God; hence that peace, which is not the daughter of grace, is the offspring of corrupt nature, and a carnal security.—God deems none worthy of peace or grace, who do not deem themselves unworthy of either or both, well knowing, that in virtue of his greatest misery he does not merit any thing, but that he stands in need of mercy. —The grace of God is not with us, unless it be also in us, and be worthily received by us.

HEUBNER: Love towards a Christian presupposes the knowledge of the truth, and the love of it. But Christ is the truth. For the truth's sake the shepherd should love his flock.—All greetings ought to have a Christian foundation.

BESSER: Every pastor is a successor to the office of the Apostles, and according to the Divine right, there is no difference between bishops, and pastors, and parsons. [On this point I beg leave to differ with the Author, although this is not the place to discuss so important a question. —M.]. *Grace*, which removes our guilt, *mercy*, which delivers us from misery, *peace*, into which grace and mercy translate us.

---

2. *Exhortation to walk in truth and love.*

vv. 4–11.

4 I rejoiced greatly that I found[1] of thy children walking in truth, as we have re-
5 ceived a commandment from the Father.[2] And now I beseech thee, lady, not as
though I wrote[3] a new commandment unto thee, but that which[4] we had from the
6 beginning, that we love one another. And this is love, that we walk after his com-
mandments. This is the commandment,[5] That, as ye have heard from the beginning,
7 ye should walk in it.[6] For many deceivers are entered[7] into the world, who confess
not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.[8] This is a deceiver and an antichrist.[9]
8 Look to yourselves, that we lose[10] not those things which we have wrought,[10] but that
9 we receive a full reward.[10] Whosoever transgresseth,[11] and abideth not in the doc-
trine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine[12] of Christ, he hath
10 both the Father and the Son.[13] If there come any unto you, and bring not this doc-
11 trine, receive him not into *your* house, neither bid him God speed:[14] For[15] he that
biddeth him[16] God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.[17]

Verse 4. [[1] German: "That I have found." So Alford, Lillie.—M.]

[2] Instead of ἐλάβομεν Cod. Sin. reads, ἔλαβον, evidently a writing error; A. and others have ἀπὸ, instead of παρὰ; B. omits τοῦ.

Verse 5. [3] A. B. G. K. Sin. γράφων; elsewhere γράφω. The arrangement of A. Sin. is: ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφων; that of B., al.: ἐντολὴν γράφων σοι καινήν. Might the former have been corrected from 1 Jno. ii. 7? [German: "Not as if I write," better "not as writing," Alford, Lillie.—M.]

[4] Cod. Sin. inserts ἐντολὴν before ἥν.

Verse 6. [5] G. Cod. Sin.: αὕτη ἐστιν ἡ ἐντολή; B. D. K, αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή ἐστιν.

[[6] German: "As ye heard from the beginning, that ye should walk in it." So Lillie and Alford, who supplies however "even" before "as ye heard, etc."—M.]

Verse 7. [7] B. Sin. ἐξῆλθον; A. ἐξῆλθαν; G. K. εἰσῆλθον. [German: "went out," Alford: "went forth." —M.]

[[8] German: "who did not confess Jesus Christ, who cometh in the flesh;" "who confess not Jesus Christ coming in (the) flesh" (Alford), so Lillie, who omits the definite Article before flesh.—M.]

[[9] German: "This is the deceiver and the antichrist." So Alford, Lillie.—M.]

Verse 8. [10] G. K.: ἀπολέσωμεν—εἰργασάμεθα—ἀπολάβωμεν; Cod. Sin.: ἀπολῆσθε (with the correction: ἀπολέσητε)—εἰργάσασθαι (ε)—ἀπολάβητε; thus also A.; but B.: ἀπολέσητε —εἰργασάμεθα—ἀπολάβητε; this is decidedly preferable as the *lectio difficilior* and *mater lectionum*. Bengel, on very slender grounds, recommends: ἀπολέσητε, εἰργάσασθε—ἀπολάβωμεν.

[German: "Look to yourselves, that ye do not lose, what things we have wrought, but that ye receive full reward."—Alford: " . . that ye lose not the things which we wrought but receive reward in full."—Lillie: " . . but receive a full reward."—M.]

Verse 9. [11] A. B. Cod. Sin.: προάγων; G. K.: παραβαίνων. The former reading is supported by the versions with the variations: *præcedit, procedit.*
[German: "Every one that progresseth;" Alford: "goeth before you." . . .—M.]
[12] A. B. Cod. Sin. omit τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which are perhaps repeated from the former half of the verse [German: "He that abideth in the doctrine;" so Alford.—M.]
[13] B. Cod. Sin.: καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν; A.: καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα.

Verse 10. [[14] German: "And do not bid him welcome;" Alford: "Do not bid him good speed:" Lillie: "neither bid him hail." The introduction of the Divine name both in this verse and the next, is avoided by almost all the versions.—M.]

Verse 11. [15] A. B. Cod. Sin.: ὁ λέγων γάρ; G. K. ὁ γὰρ λέγων. The former reading is preferable because of the weight of authority by which it is supported, and also because of its singularity.
[16] A. B. G. Cod. Sin.: αὐτῷ; αὐτὸν is probably an error; there is not sufficient reason for its omission.
[17] The Vulgate (*ed. Sixtin.*) concludes thus: *Ecce, prædixi vobis, ne in diem domini condemnemini (ut in diem—non confundamini).* The words are found in Greek in the Lectiones Velesian. (Tischendorf). They are interpolated.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 4. *Joy in* [*the lady's children*—M.] *walking in the truth.* **I rejoiced greatly.**—The Aorist ἐχάρην answers to the Perfect εὕρηκα and notes the time, when he did make the discovery, hence it is not=I rejoice (Luther). The Pauline Epistles begin with similar expressions of joy in the Christian standing of Churches; we have here, however, not an imitation but only the expression of the same Christian mode of viewing things. Cf. Rom. i. 8 sqq.; 1 Cor. i. 4 sqq.; 2 Cor. i. 3 sqq.; Eph. i. 3 sqq.; Phil. i. 3 sqq.; Col. i. 3 sqq.—

That I have found of thy children walking in truth.—The first reference here is to ἐν ἀληθείᾳ v. 3. [Alford: "not only in honesty and uprightness, but in that truth which is derived from and is part of the truth of God in Christ."—M.].—Ἐκ τῶν τεκνῶν σου is not=τὰ τέκνα σου, but should be taken in a partitive sense, though there is no need of supplying τίνας (Beza), as in 1 Jno. iv. 13; Jno. xvi. 17; Matth. xxiii. 34. The omission of the Article before περιπατοῦντας does not import that her other children did not walk ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. Ebrard's remark—"It is a *delicate* way, how the presbyter conceals the *censure* he has to express in a mere limitation of praise"—is overfine, for it cannot be maintained that the same praise of walking in truth could not be accorded to all. Εὕρηκα simply states that the Apostle had found them, but there is here no intimation how he found them, whether accidentally, or in consequence of inquiries to that effect. But περιπατοῦντας denotes sons, whom the Apostle was more likely to encounter on his missionary journeys than daughters; hence the reference seems to be rather to an accidental meeting. Lücke, not without some ground (v. 12), thinks that he met the children without their mother, elsewhere than in the family. Bengel: *Hos liberos in domo materteræ eorum invenerat Johannes*, v. 13. But this uncertainty does not favour, as Huther thinks, the hypothesis of a Church, but [rather] that of a lady.—On περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, denoting not only the Christian state, but true, vital Christianity, see 1 Jno. i. 6, 7; ii. 6; cf. 3 Jno. 3, 4; Jno. viii. 12.—

According as we received commandment from the Father.—The clause introduced by καθώς expressly refers to objective Divine truth, as the ground of Christian walking. Ebrard falsely understands καθώς in the sense of "even as we," and turns the thought "even as we have (indeed) a command from the Father (that we should walk in the truth)." But the clause in question should not be taken argumentatively, but as an apposition and explanation. Ἐντολὴν does not refer to the commandment of brotherly love (Lücke), but denotes the περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ taken as ἐντολή (de Wette, Huther, Düsterdieck).—On παρὰ τοῦ πατρός see v. 3. The interpretation of Oecumenius that Christ is here referred to as the Father of believers cannot be upheld by Is. viii. 18; Hebr. ii. 13. But the mediation of Christ is to be supplied [Huther—M.].

Reference to ἐν ἀγάπῃ (v. 3). vv. 5, 6.

Ver. 5. **And now I beseech thee, lady.**—Καὶ νῦν as in 1 Jno. ii. 28. The connection is not temporal but logical, and moreover with the whole of v. 4, not with the subordinate clause beginning with καθώς only (as Düsterdieck thinks); nor does it belong to ἐρωτῶ in order to mark the point of time. On ἐρωτῶ Schlichting says: "*blandior quædam admonendi ratio;*" Düsterdieck calls it an entreaty with a reference to the inviolable authority of the Divine law of love. Hence the Apostle adds:

Not as writing to thee a new commandment, but that which we had from the beginning.—Cf. 1 Jno. ii. 7: **that we should love one another.**—Ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, as the object of ἐρωτῶ, indicates its end and aim. Hence it does not describe or specify the substance of ἐντολή (Baumgarten-Crusius).

Ver. 6. **And this is love, that we should walk according to His commandments.**—Ἀγάπη is left undefined and nothing is said beyond its being exhibited in our walking according to the commandments of God; so that the reference is neither to love to the brethren (Benson), nor to love to God (Grotius, Carpzov., and al.), but to love in general, as in 1 Jno. iv. 7, 16 sqq.—This is the view of most and the best commentators. The end of all the commandments of God regulating the conduct of men, is love; hence ἵνα, as at 1 Jno. v. 3. Hence also κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, is here followed by ἐντολή in the Singular, as denoting their unity.

The commandment is this,—cf. 1 Jno. iii. 22, 23; it is further described as to its contents.

As ye heard from the beginning, as in v. 5. It is not a secondary aim of the commandment, as such (de Wette, Lücke).

That ye should walk in it.—Ἵνα denotes the aim and scope; ἐν αὐτῇ refers to ἀγάπῃ which should be supplied; for ἐν ἐντολῇ περιπατεῖν does not occur, and would be an intolerable tautology (against Sander). Thus the Apostle describes the identity of love, especially of brotherly love, and of obedience to God; both stand and fall together.

Description of the false teachers: v. 7.

For many deceivers.—Ὅτι grounds the reason of this exhortation to brotherly love on the Apostle's fear of its being marred by the influence of false teachers (Huther). But ὅτι is not governed by ἐρωτῶ σε (Lücke, Ewald), nor should there be mentally repeated ἐρωτῶ σε (de Wette), nor should any thought be supplied, *e. g.* "seeing that ye have the true Christianity, I have to warn you, for" (Heumann), or "*hoc non temere dixi, nam*" (Beza); nor does ὅι introduce a protasis, followed by v. 8 as apodosis (Grotius, Carpzov), wholly unlike the Johannean diction. Bengel's remark also is wrong: "*ratio cur jubeat retinere audita a principio.*" The love required (vv. 5, 6) rests on the truth (v. 7), and the ἐντολή (v. 6) embraces also the truth (v. 7, Düsterdieck). Cf. vv. 1–3, and 1 Jno. iii. 23, 16. The false teachers are called πλάνοι on account of their influence and effect on believers. 1 Jno. ii. 26; 1 Tim. iv. 1.

Went out into the world.—1 Jno. ii. 19; iv. 1; **Who do not confess Jesus Christ coming in flesh.**—Οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες denotes that whereby, or how these are πλάνοι. Winer, p. 146. But Winer (p. 405) errs in assuming a genus on account of μή: all those who do not confess, *quicunque non profitentur.* If we had οὐχ it would be equal to: οἱ ἀρνούμενοι. But the reference here is not to simple, open denial, but to a contradicting, which by various turnings and twistings, evades and endangers the definite confession. Cf. 1 Jno. iv. 2, 3. Ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί is different both from ἐληλυθότα (1 Jno. iv. 2), and from ὁ ἐλθών (1 Jno. v. 6). The Present denotes the thought *per se* "without any reference to time" 1 Cor. xv. 35 (Düsterdieck), "separate from all consideration of time" (Huther); so also Lücke, de Wette, Sander and al.—This may intimate that the false teachers denied the *possibility* of the Incarnation (Lücke). Bengel (*qui veniebat*) is beside the mark, for 3 Jno. 3, where the Participle Imperfect is clearly indicated by ἐχάρην, is not apposite here; and so is Oecumenius, who *per enallagen temporis* suggests the second advent of Christ.

This is the deceiver and the antichrist.—Οὗτος refers to οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες, and expresses plurality (πολλοὶ πλάνοι) in unity: ἐστιν ὁ πλάνος; it is a transition from the Plural to the distributive Singular; Winer, pp. 186, 654. The words καὶ ὁ ἀντίχριστος give prominence to a further characteristic of πλάνος (Huther); we must not say, however, that the πλάνος is in reality only in the many that have the πνεῦμα πλάνης (Lücke, Huther); but he is personally behind the many, who are his forerunners. Cf. 1 Jno. ii. 18, 22.

Warning against the false teachers. vv. 8, 9.

VER. 8. **Look to yourselves,** βλέπετε ἑαυτούς. They are to consider what would be the loss entailed upon themselves by being deceived, viz., the loss of fellowship with the Father and the Son, the loss of truth and love. Bengel's explanatory clauses "*me absente*" would be in point, if we had here: βλέπετε ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς, as in Mark xiii. 9. Moreover they themselves had to look to themselves, even though the Apostles were present.

That ye do not lose.—Ἵνα μή denotes the end and aim of their precaution. Matth. xii. 16; xxvi. 5; Luke xviii. 5; John vii. 23; 1 Cor. xvi. 10. The object is to avoid a loss, even a loss on the part of the readers. But of what?

What things we have wrought.—The Apostles of Jesus Christ had done, wrought and accomplished something by their labours and preaching, even a possession of truth and love with their fruits (ἃ εἰργασάμεθα), which possession will be lost, if they give ear to false teachers (Düsterdieck, Huther). This a bold self-testimony (1 Jno. i. 3; iv. 6). It is unnecessary to add ἐν ὑμῖν, as Lücke thinks, for the context supplies it. The first person does not require us to understand that the Apostle must have converted the children of the κυρία; he only includes himself in the number of the Apostles and genuine witnesses of Christ, whom he opposes to the recipients of their preaching, without determining through whose instrumentality the children of the κυρία were converted; but the teachers and their hearers are not taken together.

But that ye receive full reward.—Μισθός denotes the blessing of truth and love in one's own heart, in life with its joys and sorrows, and in eternity; μισθὸν πλήρη is the full reward, uncurtailed, as it falls to the lot of perfect fidelity (Huther, Düsterdieck); it is not=πολύν (Carpzov), nor is it said that they had only received it in part, and that they were to receive it fully in eternity (Grotius, Ebrard), for this fulness is relative; there is even here on earth a full reward, a full peace, a full παῤῥησία, etc., in conformity to the relations of this present time. But Bengel rightly observes: "*nulla merces dimidia est, aut tota amittitur, aut plena accipitur,*" but his next remark is irrelevant, viz., "*consideranda diversitas graduum in gloria;*" for the blessed have their full reward on the lowest grade. But ἀπολάβητε designates the receiving as a gift, a present (Col. iii. 24; Gal. iv. 2; Luke xvi. 25). Taking all the verbs in the first person, weakens the thought as much as taking them all in the second person (see Apparatus Crit. Note 10); in the former case the teachers and hearers are taken together, in the latter the teachers are wholly excluded, and the delicate touches, the Apostle's right of warning them, and the weight of the Apostolical warning are all lost.

VER. 9. **Every one that progresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ.**—This describes him who does not receive the full reward, of whom they are warned, whereby they lose the reward. Ὁ προάγων and μὴ μένων designate the same persons, positively and negatively. Προάγειν denotes a progression, a going before, which in the opinion of the προάγων is the reaching of a higher degree of knowledge, a decided progress, but in reality is a departure from the truth, ἐν διδαχῇ τοῦ χριστοῦ, a going beyond the limits of Christian doctrine. Huther errs in seeing here an ironical allusion (Düsterdieck); it is a bitter truth of the actual fact. On προάγειν cf. Matth. xxi. 9; 1 Tim. i. 18; v. 24. On the characteristics of those who know and learn without knowledge, see 2 Tim. iii. 7. The *lectio rec.* παραβαίνων, passing by, τὴν διδαχήν (according to Matth. xv. 3), or ἐκ τῆς διδαχῆς (Acts i. 25), and the exposition: "ἀπάγων ἑαυτόν" (Oecumenius), are clearly untenable; and in the variation of the Vulgate *recedit* instead of *precedit*, it is more pro-

bable that the former arose from the latter, than that the latter arose from the former. St. Paul also insists upon the μένειν, 2 Tim. iii. 14; i. 13; Tit. i. 9.—Ἡ διδαχὴ τοῦ χριστοῦ signifies that Paul calls the ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι (2 Tim. i. 13); the Genitive is subjective (Düsterdieck, Huther al.). Agreeably to constant usage (Matth. vii. 28; xvi. 12; xxii. 33; Mark i. 22; iv. 2; xii. 38; Acts ii. 42; v. 28), it cannot be the Genitive of the object (Bengel, Lücke, Sander, al.). Cf. Jno. viii. 31: μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ. It is the doctrine which Christ Himself brought and taught and caused to be propagated by His Apostles. But, of course, the principal part of its contents, is Christology.

Hath not God.—cf. 1 Jno. ii. 23; v. 12.—Truth, life and God are inseparable.

He that abideth in the doctrine hath both the Father and the Son.—The same thought, not only repeated positively, but completed by the addition of καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, as in 1 Jno. ii. 23. [Alford: "The order in the text is the theological one, the Father being mentioned first, then the Son. That in A. etc. is the logical and contextual one, seeing that the test is, abiding in the doctrine of Christ. Thus he has Christ, and through Him, the Father: which of the two is original, it is impossible to decide."—M.].

Warning against fellowship with the false teachers. vv. 10, 11.

Ver. 10. **If any cometh to you.**—Εἴ τις ἔρχεται shows that the case supposed actually existed. Winer, p. 307. Ἐὰν with the subjunctive denotes a possibility. There is hence no occasion for surprise, as if this were unjohannean (de Wette, Ebrard), since it cannot be unjohannean to suppose a case as actually existing. Πρὸς ὑμᾶς, as in 2 Tim. iii. 6, refers to the forwardness of the false teachers and their calculating on the greater receptivity and mouldableness of women.

And bringeth not this doctrine.—Καὶ adds the capacity and character in which such persons come, not as soliciting aid, as necessitous persons, but as false teachers (Bengel: *quasi doctor aut frater*). The use of οὐ φέρει, instead of μή, also shows that the case mentioned is actually true, and imports the simple denial of φέρειν. Similar is φέρειν κατηγορίαν, Jno. xviii. 29 (Acts xxv. 7). It is unnecessary to supply here that the contrary doctrine is brought (de Lyra), and that the true doctrine is disputed (Tirinus); this is self-evident from 1 John iv. 2, 3. Ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν is τὴν διδαχὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ. *Non de iis, qui alieni semper fuerunt ab ecclesia* (1 Cor. v. 10), *sed de iis qui volunt fratres haberi et doctrinam evertunt* (Grotius).

Receive him not into (your) **house.**—On the above supposition the point in question is not an act of φιλοξενία (Heb. xiii. 2; Rom. xii. 13); for the reference is not to the necessitous. The injunction simply bears upon the false teachers not being received into the house (αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν λαμβάνειν), on account of the danger *per se*.

And do not bid him welcome, which was unavoidable if they were received into the house; the two circumstances should be taken together; for while the former would be dangerous, the latter would be untrue; χαίρειν, joy, good speed, prosperity, cannot be said to the false teacher; only to ὁμοτρόποις and ὁμοπίστοις is due the Christian, fraternal greeting, in its deeper import (Oecumenius, Calov, Bengel, Lücke, de Wette, Huther, Düsterdieck and al). This χαίρειν μὴ λέγετε must therefore not be limited to the *salutatio* as a conventional form of politeness (Clemens Alex.), or as an expression of friendship (Grotius), or be taken quite generally: *velut hic Joannes omne colloquium, omne consortium, omne commercium cum hæreticis* (a Lapide), or applied to excommunication (Vitringa, *de syn. vet.* p. 759); nor must it be referred to the κρίσις which was necessary only at that time (Lücke), nor must it be construed, according to the now prevailing loftier view that man, all his errors notwithstanding, remains man and an object of esteem and love, as an act of intolerance which may have been justifiable at that time (de Wette), or be charged to the fiery temperament of the Apostle, according to the notices contained in Luke ix. 54 and Euseb. Hist. Eccl. III. 28; IV. 14. The reference is simply to the cultivation of personal acquaintance and fraternal intercourse with the false teachers; this is, and continues to be, forbidden; brotherly love in its depth, truth and blessedness has its limits. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis* II. 2, p. 339.

Ver. 11. **For he that biddeth him welcome, partaketh in his deeds, the evil ones.**—Γὰρ gives the reason of the injunction; in the words ὁ λέγων αὐτῷ χαίρειν the Apostle gives prominence to the one point which is closely connected with the other: αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν λαμβάνειν. The clause κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ shows that we have here not simply an outward conventional form of politeness, but an "inward relation of communion" (Huther), which is fostered. The ἔργα τὰ πονηρά are primarily acts of communicating false doctrine, but secondarily also the whole ethical conduct connected with it, which injures God, Christ, the Church, the truth, individual communities, believers and their souls.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The knowledge of the truth from God is acquired in the way of obedience to the will of God (v. 4).

2. The law of God should only be viewed as the revelation of His love, and as it originates in love, so it impels to love (vv. 5, 6).

3. The acme and ground of all error is the denial of the Incarnation of Christ (v. 7). He that breaks with Christ come in the flesh and as the Son of man ever the Coming One, breaks brotherhood with believers and forces them to break brotherhood with him. Besser truly says: "The doctrine *of Christ* is through and through *from Christ*. 'It is I,' is the fundamental theme of the Gospel, preached by Himself and the holy Apostles, from beginning to end." Believing Catholics, Lutherans, Reformed, United, are brethren and remain brethren, because they are living Christians, the children of God and coheirs with Christ. But he ought hardly to have used this passage for the purpose of warning against the union nor to have said: "Yes, people reverse the meaning of John and are perchance afraid to hold private intercourse with manifest blasphemers and revilers of the Divine truth, perhaps to take coffee with them, but—

alas! *our* table has become more holy to us than *God's* table." For these things occur, inside the same communion, every where and at all times, if instead of putting blasphemers, he had said: hypocrites or adulterers.

4. False teachers corrupt not only the christological truth, but also the work of the Church and the salvation of individual church-members (vv. 7, 8).

5. The promised reward is not a merit of good works, but a consequence of Divine appointment, and a communicated gift (v. 8).

6. True progress is only possible in the maintenance and on the foundation of Christian truth (v. 9). For men come short not so much in the desire to be furthered, as in the judgment as to what constitutes true progress, and what is the true mode of progressing. A striving forward with a good conscience will always be a diligent and faithful road-maker bridging over the chasm between himself and signal successes, by the most faithful and scrupulous discharge of duty.

7. In the converse among Christians love must not be practised at the expense of truth and truthfulness (vv. 10, 11), nor must the truth be spoken at the expense of love!

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Compare Doctrinal and Ethical.

Starke:—Preachers should rejoice most when they see that young children are well trained, grow in grace and make the beginning of their wisdom in the fear of the Lord.—Christians have also their joy in the world, though not of the world.—Godly children are their parents' joy, the ornament of the Church and the joy of all godly people. Young plants of righteousness look more beautiful in the garden of the Lord, than old trees on the point of decaying.—Truth is not only to be investigated and meditated upon, but it must be practised, and men should walk in it.—A preacher should not always use severity and earnestness, but also lenity and gentleness, not command but entreat his people to become godly.—Whenever thou lackest the mind to follow, thou art wont to cry: it is a novelty! Thou utterest a falsehood! Hear what St. John says: To love, which contains all the commandments, has been from the beginning.—Christianity needs no new commandments, but it requires the constantly renewed inculcation of the old commandments.—It is not enough that the truth be preached, falsehood must also be denounced. The heresies, persecutions and abuses in the Church of God must not cause us to waver, and doubt the truth of the Christian religion, but rather strengthen and confirm us while we are exposed to their danger.—Alas, by nature we all have an antichristian mind and antichrist in our hearts; he who does not know and expel him, will nevermore know or avoid the outward antichrist.—Ye that are wise overmuch and are anxious about unnecessary things, ye that judge and censure every thing, hear what St. John says: "Look to yourselves."—Delightful reward of faithful ministers, if they see in their hearers the fruit of their labour arranged according to the mind of Christ.—The less regard a minister pays to the temporal reward in his office, the more is he faithful, and the greater will be the reward which he shall receive from Christ, the Great Shepherd.—What can a man lack who has God, and what can a man possess who has not God? If none may receive into their houses wicked and false teachers, how much the more ought they not to be introduced into the sheepfold of Christ, which would be like taking wolves among sheep! It is injurious to have fellowship with false people, but still more injurious to open to them the door of our heart; where the first is done, the latter is wont not to be wanting.—Who enters into a pest-house? Do we not flee a bedfellow affected with a venomous disease? Why not likewise a deceiver, a servant of Satan? The opposite takes place in the world: be friendly to everybody except to Christ in His members!—The greetings of Christians should not be merely conventional, but spring from the ground of truth and love.—A Christian should be on his guard not only against his own sins, but also against those of others, of which he may easily and in various ways become partaker.

Heubner:—The children of the same family are not always of one mind; a godly mother may have unbelieving children.—Christian mothers, Christian families are a blessing to the world.—Those also who run already in the Christian course need stirring up.—A Christian's treasure is liable to be lost as long as he continues to live among deceivers and enemies; hence the necessity of foresight, courage and fidelity of vigilance over himself and in respect of temptation: the more precious the treasure, the more carefully should it be guarded. It is slowly acquired, but may be lost at once. The number of those who once had grace and then lost it, will one day appear very great.—John teaches us what we should ask of every one that comes to us, to wit: do you bring Christ with you or not? Reception was denied to a false teacher, because it would have been a token of brotherly acknowledgment; but this was so much the more to be denied, because such reception took place in the name of the Church, and hence would have been a declaration that the whole Church did receive him as a brother. But on that account we need not in a case of emergency deny to such an one our bounden private love.—Love should never be prejudicial to the confession of our faith. Love at the expense of faith, to its injury or with its denial is no love. This commandment was falsely applied in the case of John a Lasco, who having been expelled from England in the reign of Mary, A. D., 1553, was denied reception in Denmark, both he and his congregation (Salig, *Hist. Conf. Aug.* II., 1090).

Besser:—It is an idle speech that Christians and antichristians have one and the same God. "We are believers in one God" is sung in truth by those only who continue: "We also believe in Jesus Christ, His Son and our Lord."

THE CONCLUSION.

vv. 12, 13.

12 Having many things to write unto you, I would not *write*[1] with paper and ink; but[2] I
13 trust to come[3] unto you, and speak face to face,[4] that our[5] joy may be full. The chil-
dren of thy elect sister greet thee.[6] Amen.[7]

Verse 12. [[1] German omits "*write*" supplied in E. V.—M.]
[2] ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω is the reading of the best and of most Codices, also of Cod. Sin. A. al. read ἐλπίζω γάρ.
[3] πρὸς ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι is the most authentic reading; ἐλθεῖν *lect. rec.* supported by G. K.; Coptic version has ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς according to 3 Jno. 14.
[[4] German: "mouth to mouth;" Alford, Lillie.—M.]
[5] Cod. Sin. G. K.: Χαρὰ ἡμῶν; A. B. ὑμῶν. The former, on account of 1 Jno. i. 4 is *lectio difficilior*.
Verse 13. [[6] German: "There greet thee the children of thy sister, the elect one." Alford: "These greet thee the children of thine elect sister."—M.]
[7] Ἀμήν, at the conclusion, is wanting. Cod. Sin. A. B.; Ἰωάννου β΄· Others add ἐπιστολή, others τοῦ θεολόγου, and still others καθολική.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Breaking off. v. 12.

Ver. 12. **Having many things to write to you.**—His heart is full; he had only written very little of what he had in his heart. Hence it is unwarrantable to see, with Ebrard, in most of these verses, simply citations from the First Epistle.

I would not [write them] **with paper and ink.**—The Infinitive from the preceding clause: *πολλὰ ἔχων ὑμῖν γράφειν* should, of course, be supplied here. *Διὰ χάρτου καὶ μέλανος* denotes the written character of his communication; the more common phrase is: *διὰ μέλανος—καὶ καλάμου*, 3 Jno. 13.—*Ὁ χάρτης* is the Egyptian papyrus, probably the so-called Augustan or Claudian, for letters; *τὸ μέλαν*, also 2 Cor. iii. 3, ink made of soot, water and gum; *ὁ κάλαμος*, the writing reed, probably split (*μεσοσχιδής, μεσότομος*). Cf. Lücke on this passage. The Aorist *οὐκ ἐβουλήθην*, from the standpoint of the readers on receiving the Epistle, because he wished to communicate it personally, orally.

But I hope to come to you and to speak [say it] **mouth to mouth.**—The antithesis of *γράφειν διὰ χάρτου καὶ μέλανος* is *πρὸς ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι καὶ στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλῆσαι*; because he hopes for the latter, he has broken off the former; but this does not import that he did reserve part of the doctrine necessary to salvation for oral tradition (Barth. Petrus); for he surely spoke only what he had written in the first Epistle. On *γένεσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς* see Jno. vi. 21, 25; Acts xx. 16; xxi. 17; xxv. 15; 1 Cor. xvi. 10; Jno. x. 35; Acts x. 13=to turn towards a person or place. On *στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλῆσαι*, cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 12; Xenoph. *Mem.* II., 6, 32; and פֶּה אֶל־פֶּה, Numb. xii. 8.

That our joy may be fulfilled [filled full].—The aim (*ἵνα*) is to fill up his own and the readers' joy, and then that of the hearers. Cf. notes on 1 Jno. i. 4. The object of joy is not the personal presence of the Apostle (Bengel), but the full communication of the truth in oral intercourse.

The greetings, v. 13.

Ver. 13. **There greet thee the children of thy sister, the elect one.**—To explain *τῆς ἀδελφῆς* of a Church, and *τέκνα* of church-members is not warranted by any thing found here; the reason why the sister herself does not send greetings, may be death, or absence, but "can neither be ascertained, nor is it a proper question" (Düsterdieck *versus* Huther). Bengel: "*Suavissima communitas! Comitas apostoli, minorum verbis salutem nunciantis.*"

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Starke:—Both what the Apostles wrote and what they spoke is the word of God, and we do well to bear this in mind.—A true reader is he, who not satisfied with the written Epistle or the printer's work on paper, suffers the Holy Spirit to write in his heart and thus becomes himself an Epistle of the living God.—It is a blessing of God if we have the opportunity given to us of conferring with friends on matters of importance and of enjoying the benefit of their counsel.—The children of the world imagine that the life of the godly consists in nothing but dejected looks and constant sorrowing; but here applies that saying: as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing.—He is the servant of his belly, but not the servant of Christ, who seeks in his office other joy than the salvation of his hearers.—It is and ever will be a beautiful custom to interchange cordial greetings with friends in Epistles and in other ways, and thus to desire for them all temporal and spiritual prosperity.—Happy are those sisters and brothers who besides being united by the ties of nature, are also firmly united by the tie of Divine grace. For it is eternal grace only, which works alliances of eternal friendship.

Heubner:—With us it is often the opposite; we have much to write and little to speak, when we do meet.—When those who are one in faith, meet and converse together of the grace of God, of which they have made experience, they have a foretaste of heavenly joy.

THE

THIRD EPISTLE GENERAL OF JOHN THE APOSTLE.

(Ἰωάννου γ in B. and Cod. Sinait. C. adds ἐπιστολή, G. τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου.)

I. *The Address.*

v. 1.

The elder unto the well beloved Gaius, whom I love in the truth[1].

Verse 1. [[1] German: The presbyter to the beloved Gaius, whom I love in truth.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. On ὁ πρεσβύτερος see Introduction § 1. It can hardly be determined whether this Gaius is one of the two or three persons of that name, who are mentioned as friends and companions of Paul in Acts xix. 29; xx. 4; Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. i. 14. Lücke thinks that our Gaius is identical with Gaius of Derbe mentioned Acts xx. 4, Wolf, in his *Curis ad. h. l.*, that the Gaius mentioned 1 Cor. i. 14 is meant here. Others suppose that the Gaius, mentioned Constit. Ap. 7, 46, and appointed by John Bishop of Pergamus, is the one referred to here (Whiston); but this is also purely hypothetical. Nor can it be inferred from v. 8 of this Epistle that Gaius was a presbyter. As John adds to the address the term τῷ ἀγαπητῷ, so he also addresses him as ἀγαπητέ in vv. 3, 5, 11, and superadds as in 2 John 1, the words: ὃν ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (Oecumenius: ὁ κατὰ κύριον ἀγαπῶν ἐνδιαθέτῳ ἀγάπῃ).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Starke: Those who wish to be loved of men, must be lovable and worthy of love; this is done, if they give up the love of the world, and love God only.—Truth and love are precious jewels of Christians, which must be linked together and are more ornamental than golden chains. The one cannot exist without the other; truth without love is dead, and love without truth is blind.

The Apostle's joys and sorrows.

vv. 2–11.

2 Beloved, I wish above all things[1] that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even
3 as thy soul prospereth. For[2] I rejoiced greatly when the[3] brethren came and testified
4 of the truth that is in thee,[4] even as thou[5] walkest in the truth.[6] I have no greater
5 joy than[7] to hear that my children walk in truth.[8] Beloved, thou doest faithfully[9]
6 whatsoever thou doest[10] to the brethren, and[11] to strangers; Which have borne wit-
ness of thy charity before the church[12]: whom if thou bring forward on their journey
7 after a godly sort, thou shalt do well:[13] Because that for his name's sake[14] they
8 went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles.[15] We therefore ought to receive[16] such,
9 that we might be fellow helpers to the truth[17]. I wrote unto the church[18]: but Dio-

10 trephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them,[19] receiveth us not. Where-
fore, if I come, I will remember[20] his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with
malicious words[21]: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the
brethren, and[22] forbiddeth them that would, and casteth *them* out of the church.
11 Beloved, follow[23] not that which is evil, but that which is good. He that doeth good
12 is of God: but[24] he that doeth evil hath not seen God. Demetrius hath good report
of all *men*, and of the truth itself[25]: yea, and we *also* bear record; and ye know[26] that
our record[27] is true.

Verse 2. [[1] German: "In all things." So Lillie. "Concerning all things." Alford.—M.]

Verse 3. [2] Cod. Sin. and several minusc. omit γὰρ after ἐχάρην.
[[3] German: "When brethren came." Lillie.—M.]
[[4] German: "And testified to thy truth;" so Alford, Lillie.—M.]
[5] σὺ is emphatic, omitted in A., but inserted in B. C. G. K. Cod. Sin.
[[6] German: "In truth," without the Article; so Alford, Lillie.—M.]

Verse 4. [7] The best authorities read τούτων; ταύτης found only in minusc. and versions, is doubtless a correction.—Some read χάριν instead of χαρὰν. [German: "Greater than this I have no joy, that;" Lillie: "Greater joy than this I have none, to hear;" Alford: "I have no greater joy than this, that."—M.]
[8] A. B. ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ; C. Cod. Sin. al. omit the Article.

Verse 5. [[9] German: "Beloved, thou actest faithfully." So Lillie.—M.]
[10] B C. G. K. Cod. Sin. al. read ἐργάσῃ, so that the ἐργάζῃ of A cannot stand.
[11] A. B. C. Cod. Sin. al. have καὶ τοῦτο, instead of καὶ εἰς τοὺς, of G. K. [German: "And that strangers." So Alford.—M.]

Verse 6. [[12] German: "Who have testified to thy love before the Church;" so Lillie and Alford, who renders however: "in the presence of the Church."—M.]
[[13] German: "Whom thou shalt do well to conduct (forward) worthily of God." Alford: "Whom thou wilt do well if thou forward on their way, worthily of God;" Lillie: "Whom thou shalt do well to forward their way, in a manner worthy of God."—M.]

Verse 7. [[14] German: "For they went out on behalf of the name;" Lillie: "For in behalf of the name they went forth." Alford: "On behalf of."—M.]
[15] A. B. C. Cod. Sin. al. read ἐθνικῶν, instead of ἐθνῶν, the reading of G. K. [German: "Receiving nothing from the heathens."—M.]

Verse 8. [16] A. B. C. Cod. Sin. al.: ὑπολαμβάνειν; G. K.: ἀπολαμβάνειν.
[17] Τῇ ἀληθείᾳ; Cod. Sin.: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, with the emendation τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. [The latter reading, without the emendation, occurs also in A.—M.]

Verse 9. [18] A. B. C. Cod. Sin. read τι; a hand has added ἄν in Cod. Sin. [German: "I wrote somewhat to the Church;" so Alford.—M.]
[[19] German: "But he who loveth to be the first of them, Diotrephes, does not receive us;" Lillie: "But he who loveth to be foremost among them, Diotrephes, doth not admit us;" Alford: "Howbeit, Diotrephes, who loveth preëminence over them, receiveth us not."—M.]

Verse 10. [[20] German: "Therefore, if I come, I will bring to remembrance;" so Lillie; Alford: "Bring to mind."—M.]
[[21] German: "Wicked words."—M.]
[[22] German: "And not contented with this, neither does he himself receive the brethren, but also, those who would do it, he hindereth, and casteth out of the Church."—M.]

Verse 11. [[23] German: "Imitate not evil, but good;" so Alford.—M.]
[24] ὁ κακοποιῶν is best authenticated [A. B. C. K.—M.]; ὁ δὲ κακοπ., *text. rec.*, is only feebly supported. [German: "He that doeth evil," omits the "but" of E. V., so Alford.—M.]

Verse 12. [25] C. inserts τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ before τῆς ἀληθείας. Instead of ἀληθείας A. probably reads ἐκκλησίας. [A. corrected, B. G. K. read ἀληθείας. German: "Unto Demetrius testimony hath been borne by all, and by the truth itself."—M.]
[[26] German: "And thou knowest; A. B. C. al. Vulg.: οἶδας; οἴδατε l. r. according to the G. K. al. several versions, etc.—M.]
[[27] German: "That our testimony is true."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Wish for the prosperity of Gaius. vv. 2–4.

VER. 2. **Beloved**:—Joy in and care for Gaius account for the accumulation of terms of endearment.

In all things I wish that thou mayest prosper.—Περὶ πάντων is simply idiomatic: with respect to all things: περί, with the idea of including, encircling, shutting in, both in connection with substantives and absolutely, is found at the head of whole sentences in the sense of *adtinet ad;* 1 Cor. xvi. 1. Cf. Winer, p. 390, sq. Connected with εὔχομαι, which signifies "to wish," but carries here also the force of intercession (cf. Jas. v. 15), the most natural sense is "praying for, concerning all things," without any necessity for recurring to the Homeric usage of the preposition, viz. *prae*=above all things, as alleged by Schott, Düsterdieck and others. Rather than giving it that construction, we may connect περὶ πάντων with εὐοδοῦσθαι (Bengel, Huther, al.), which connection is affected neither by the rhetorical emphasis of the position of περὶ πάντων (Lücke), nor by the circumstance that it cannot belong to ὑγιαίνειν.—The prosperity referred to (εὐοδοῦσθαι) is general, *in re familiari* (Bengel), in all outward relations of life. Εὐοδοῦν, to make, lead a good way (εὐοδία) is transitive, while εὐοδεῖν to have a good way, is intransitive; hence the Passive, which carries the same force as the intransitive verb. Cf. Rom. i. 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Lücke, Düsterdieck and al.—Καὶ ὑγιαίνειν singles out a particular point. Possibly Gaius had been sick (Düsterdieck), or was in delicate health; but this cannot be inferred with certainty as a fact, for health *per se* is important enough, if outward prosperity is the matter referred to.

Even as thy soul prospereth.—Oecumenius: ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πολιτείᾳ, consequently

in that it has the truth, and that he walks in it (v. 3); the words καθὼς εὐοδοῦταί σου ἡ ψυχή contain a high encomium on Gaius and the object of the Apostle's particular rejoicing.

VER. 3. **For I rejoiced greatly.**—On ἐχάρην γὰρ λίαν see 2 Jno. 4. These words give the reason of the encomium, as of a well authenticated fact.

When brethren came and testified to thy truth.—The connection with the Aorist ἐχάρην requires us to continue the Participles ἐρχομένων καὶ μαρτυρούντων as Imperfects, as in Luke xvii. 12 (Lücke, Huther, Düsterdieck al.); the Dative σου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ governed by μαρτυρεῖν (as in vv. 6, 12; Jno. v. 33; xviii. 37; iii. 26) denotes the truth become subjective in Gaius; hence not=*sinceritas* (a Lapide, Beza and al.), but inward, Christian life, born of the truth, and itself truth (Lücke, Huther, Düsterdieck and al.); the restriction to *liberalitas* (Lorinus), is inadmissible.

As thou walkest in truth.—This clause contains the testimony of the brethren, hence it is an indirect clause recording the Christianity of Gaius as evidenced by his walk; on that account we have also ἀκούω in v. 4, so that it is not the testimony of the Apostle added to that of the brethren (Besser). So Brückner, Huther, Düsterdieck, and al. The express and emphatic σύ denotes that the testimony of the brethren had been different with reference to others, for instance in the case of Diotrephes vv. 9, 10.

VER. 4. **I have no greater joy than this.**—Here the Apostle expresses his mind in general. On μειζοτέραν, a double comparative, like Eph. iii. 8, see Winer, p. 81. Grotius: "*Est ad intendendam significationem comparativus e comparativo factus.*" The Genitive τούτων is not=ταύτης, the neuter Plural, carrying a general reference, is restricted by the following ἵνα to one idea. Winer, p. 175 compares ἐφ' οἷς and ἀνθ' ὧν, also μετὰ ταῦτα and καὶ ταῦτα *idque*, Heb. xi. 12, and cites Jno. i. 51.

That I hear my children are walking in the truth.—On ἵνα see Jno. xv. 13. It signifies the Apostle's desire to hear this; this is his whole aim. Τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα are the Christians committed to John; the members of the Churches confided to his care and placed under his paternal direction (Huther).

Praise and necessity of hospitality. vv. 5–8.

VER. 5. **Beloved**, as in v. 2.

Thou actest faithfully.—πιστὸν ποιεῖς; Oecumenius: ἄξιον πιστοῦ ἀνδρός. Bengel: "*Facis quiddam quod facile a te pollicebar mihi et fidelibus;*" this explanation is too narrow, the reference to the πίστις which lays hold of the ἀλήθεια and carries out in love being too definite. But it is not on that account=πίστιν ποιεῖσθαι (Ebrard).

Whatsoever thou doest for the brethren.—Ὃ ἐὰν (ἂν)=*quodcunque* denotes that this activity had various modes of expression and made itself felt in different directions. On ἐργάζεσθαι εἰς, cf. Matth. xxvi. 10.

And that strangers.—Καὶ τοῦτο, as in 1 Cor. vi. 6; Eph. ii. 8; Phil. i. 28, is not different in point of sense from καὶ εἰς τοὺς ξένους: *and that=this too for* (*towards*) *strangers*. This additional particular shows that the brethren were unknown and strangers, and acknowledges and praises the hospitality of Gaius as more liberal and not confined merely to brethren personally known to him. On the importance of φιλοξενία, cf. Heb. xiii. 2; Rom. xii. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 9.

VER. 6. **Who have testified to thy love before the Church.**—Οἳ ἐμαρτύρησαν are the strange brethren; not only some of their number singled out (de Wette). Ἐνώπιον τῆς ἐκκλησίας denotes the Church where the Apostle was at the time of writing (Grotius, Huther, Düsterdieck al.), before which they gave an account of their experience [on their missionary journey—M.], like in Acts xiv. 27, and made mention of the love of Gaius. Bengel's "*publice commemorabantur exempla ad hortandum*" goes too far.

Whom thou shalt do well to conduct (forward) **worthily of God.**—The reading: οὓς καλῶς ποιήσεις προπέμψας is established; the Future with the *part. aor.* is difficult. The Future is simple and clear; Gaius will do well; we must not construe it, with Huther, as *Futur. exactum.* For at Mark xiii. 13, the being saved (σωθήσεται) does not take place until after the enduring is accomplished (ὁ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος). Cf. Winer, p. 306, where only the *part. aor.* carries the force of the *futur. exact.* But the action of Gaius is not finished until he has accomplished the providing and speeding forward of the brethren; this is the sense of the *part. aor.* In such a connection the Future indicates a certain expectation, not without the direction softened by the Future, even as the ὀφείλομεν, v. 8, is *morata formula hortandi* (Bengel). It is more allowable to see here with Luther, a vagueness of expression than to venture with Ebrard on the correction ἐποίησας. As καλῶς qualifies ποιεῖν (Acts x. 33; Phil. iv. 14), so ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ qualifies προπέμπειν, to fit out for a journey (Tit. iii. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 11); in a manner worthy of God [whose messengers they are—M.], with all care and love (Lücke); the *viaticum* (Grotius), *commeatus* (Bengel), will not be wanting; but this is not all. Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 12; Col. i. 10.

VER. 7. **For they went forth on behalf of the name.**—Ἐξῆλθαν; the reason why they went forth is intimated by ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος, as in Acts v. 41, on behalf of the name of Christ, cf. Jas. ii. 7, even for the purpose of preaching it, as in Rom. i. 6, so that they went forth as missionaries, as in Acts xv. 40 (Lücke, Huther, Düsterdieck and others). Hence the reference is neither to the name of God, which would require αὐτοῦ, and then to be referred back to τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 6, nor only to the Christian religion, and least of all to the name of the brethren who were called missionaries (Paulus). The connection of ἐξῆλθαν with ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνικῶν is untenable (Beza, Bengel, al.), which belongs to λαμβάνοντες.

Receiving nothing from the heathens.—The *Part. Præs.* with μηδὲν denotes the maxim of the missionaries not to receive any support from the heathens (Huther, Düsterdieck), agreeably to Matth. x. 8. The Mathematical astrologers and thaumaturgs did, on the contrary, make a business of religious affairs. But compare also the practice of St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 7, sqq.; xii. 16, sqq., 1 Thess. ii. 9, sqq.), although he might not take any thing from the younger Churches. On the construction of λαμβάνειν ἀπό, cf. Matth. xvii. 25, and Winer, p. 388, note 1.

Ver. 8. **We therefore ought to receive such persons.**—In contrast to τῶν ἐθνικῶν the Apostle begins with: ἡμεῖς οὖν [οὖν because they receive nothing from the heathens, *therefore* we, etc.—M.]. The communicative Plural denotes the general Christian duty to take part in missions; hence ὀφείλομεν. There is a fine play on the word ὑπολαμβάνειν after μηδὲν λαμβάνοντες; *elegans antanaclasis* (Carpzov). According to Strabo's definition: οἱ εὔποροι τοὺς ἐνδεεῖς ὑπολαμβάνουσι, this word implies both the προπέμπειν (v. 6), and the λαμβάνειν εἰς οἰκίαν (2 Jno. 10).

That we may become fellow-workers (for) the truth.—The purpose (ἵνα) is a noble one, viz. to serve the truth and work for it. The Dative τῇ ἀληθείᾳ denotes the object to which the work of the missionaries is devoted; we should become the assistants and fellow-workers of the missionaries; συν also refers back to τοιούτους, not to τῇ ἀληθείᾳ as Luther, Bengel and Besser allege. Our view is also held by Brückner, Huther, Düsterdieck. Cf. Col. iv. 11: συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; 1 Thess. iii. 2; συνεργὸν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ; 2 Cor. viii. 23: εἰς ὑμᾶς.

Complaint of a hostile person. vv. 9, 10.

Ver. 9. **I wrote somewhat to the Church.**—Ἔγραψα designates a lost Epistle; τι does not imply that the writing was specially important, but brief, he wrote somewhat (Lücke, Huther, Düsterdieck), the writing was not particularly valuable [nothing is said one way or another, τι leaves the matter quite indefinite and merely imports that he had written somewhat—M.]. The reference here cannot be to the *first* Epistle (Wolf, Stier al.), or to the *second*, for they contain not the remotest allusion to the relations here specified. Diotrephes might have withheld it from the Church (Huther).—The Church to which he had written (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ), is that of which Gaius was a member, who was to correct and repair the injuries done by Diotrephes (vv. 5–8, 11). Hence it is wrong to hold with Bengel ("*illius loci, ex quo exierunt. Occupatio: ne Cajus dicat, cur itur ad nos?*"), with whom Besser agrees, that the reference here is to the Church from which the missionaries went forth.

But he who loveth to be foremost among them, Diotrephes, doth not receive us.—We have no particulars concerning Diotrephes; it neither may be affirmed nor denied that he was a presbyter or deacon of the Church. But φιλοπρωτεύων renders it more improbable than probable. It is a pure conjecture to describe him as an opponent of the Jewish Christians (Grotius), or as a gnostic or judaistic false teacher; he was *ambitiosus;* this is known. Schol. I. defines φιλοπρωτεύων thus: ὁ ὑφαρπάζων τὰ πρωτεῖα.—Αὐτῶν is taken from ἐκκλησία, [the collective noun—M.], and designates the members of the Church who, as Huther supposes, were wont to meet at his house. Ἐπιδέχεσθαι ἡμᾶς signifies to receive us; hence not: to acknowledge our Epistles and exhortations (de Lyra, Grotius, Lücke, de Wette and al.).—Huther 1st ed. [corrected in the 2d—M.]. In not complying with the directions given in the Apostle's Epistle, Diotrephes virtually delined to receive the Apostle himself (v. 10).

Ver. 10. **Therefore, if I come, I will bring to remembrance the works which he doeth.**—With διὰ τοῦτο the Apostle bases his coming and censure on the refractory conduct of Diotrephes. On ἐὰν ἔλθω see 1 Jno. ii. 28. That it would take place soon is indicated by εὐθέως, v. 14. It is not necessary to supply αὐτὸν (Huther), or ἐκκλησίαν (Paulus) after ὑπομνήσω; the Accusative of the person which is added in Jno. xiv. 26; Tit. iii. 1 is also wanting in 2 Tim. ii. 14.—It was the Apostle's intention to censure not only Diotrephes, who was not singular in his reprehensible conduct, but had a friendly party backing him. Bede: "*In omnium notitiam manifestius arguendo producam.*" Although the connection requires us to understand the feature of censure (de Lyra: *puniam*, Bengel: *notabo, ut sentiat, animadvertam*), the idea of an instructive calling to mind is by all means to be retained; the censure lies in the matter being mentioned and that publicly. Αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα, ἃ ποιεῖ are the object of ὑπομιμνήσκειν, and these consist in the sequel, viz.:

Prating against us with wicked words.—On λόγοις πονηροῖς see 2 Jno. 11; 1 Jno. iii. 12. They were slanderous words calculated to lower and detract from the Apostle's influence, but idle, worthless tattle, untenable falsehoods; hence φλυαρῶν, "*apposite calumnias Diotrephis vocat garritum*" (à Lapide); the intransitive verb has a transitive reference to ἡμᾶς taken from the λόγοις πονηροῖς; a similar construction may be seen in μαθητεύω, Matth. xxviii. 19; θριαμβεύω, Col. ii. 15 (properly *nugari*, cf. i. Tim. v. 13.)

And not contented with this.—Ἀρκεῖσθαι with the Dative only, occurs at Luke iii. 14; Heb. xiii. 5 instead of ἐπὶ τούτοις; μὴ ἀρκούμενος with φλυαρεῖν against the Apostles, he wrongs the missionary brethren in two ways, viz.:

Neither doth he himself receive the brethren.—Οὔτε followed by καὶ is of frequent occurence, see Winer p. 516, 7. Αὐτὸς answers to βουλομένους. Ἐπιδέχεσθαι signifies literally to receive, to entertain hospitably, 2 Jno. 10. The reference is to the ἀδελφοί mentioned v. 7.

But also, those who would do it, he hindereth.—There was consequently no lack of well-disposed Church-members; but he κωλύει by force, imperiousness, cunning tricks and speeches.

And casteth out of the Church.—Ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας may signify: to excommunicate, but according to the context also to turn out of the local congregation. In the latter case κωλύει and ἐκβάλλει would have the same object; but in the former ἀδελφοί would be the object with αὐτούς understood. The former, adopted by Düsterdieck on account of the meaning of the word and the construction, seems to be improbable, because excommunication in a case which had no reference to false doctrine or immorality of life, would be immoderate and unheard of, and hardly conceivable at that time. But it might be possible that Diotrephes was wont to hold, or caused to be held, the meetings of the Church in his own house, and refused admittance to those who were opposed to him; but that would not be an excommunication. Huther, who maintains the other view, seems to enter more

fully into the circumstances hinted at, and to avoid untenable conjectures.

Exhortation and Commendation. vv. 11, 12.

VER. 11. **Beloved**; peculiarly emphatic as following what goes before. 1 Jno. iv. 1, 7, 11.

Imitate not evil but good.—On μὴ μιμοῦ see Hebr. xiii. 7; 2 Thess. iii. 7, 9; Eph. v. 1. Τὸ κακόν *in Diotrephe*, Τὸ ἀγαθόν *in Demetrio* (Bengel). De Wette erroneously asserts that the diction here is "*unjohannean*," for we have τὰ ἔργα πονηρὰ and δίκαια in 1 Jno. iii. 12; τὸ κακόν in Jno. xviii. 28; τὰ ἀγαθά and τὰ φαῦλα in Jno. v. 29: the diction is generally biblical, 1 Pet. iii. 10, 11.

He that doeth good, is (out) **of God.**—Cf. 1 Jno. iii. 10. Ὁ ἀγαθοποιῶν is general, as before (1 Pet. ii. 14; xv. 20; iii. 6, 17); a Lapide, Grotius, Paulus and al. erroneously apply and restrict this expression to benevolence and hospitality.

He that doeth evil, hath not seen God.—It is inconceivable how Lücke and de Wette can call this expression "*unjohannean*," considering that ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστιν with the constantly recurring ἐκ θεοῦ εἶναι (1 Jno. iv. 2, 3, 4, 6; iii. 10; v. 19) is manifestly "*johannean*," and that we read at 1 Jno. iii. 6: οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτὸν notwithstanding the addition there of οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν αὐτὸν, and at 1 Jno. iv. 8: οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν θεόν, 1 Jno. ii. 8: ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν.

VER. 12. **Unto Demetrius testimony hath been borne by all, and by the truth itself.**—Demetrius was probably the bearer of this Epistle (Lücke, Düsterdieck, Huther), and John commends him to Gaius. Hence he cannot be one of the βουλόμενοι, whom Diotrephes is said to have hindered and excommunicated (Ebrard); in that case he would have been a member of the congregation to which Gaius belonged, and known to him. The Perfect μεμαρτύρηται denotes a testimony which has been given and continues to be valid; used absolutely, without any further qualification, it always denotes a good testimony (Acts vi. 3; x. 22; xvi. 2, etc.). In ὑπὸ πάντων the reference is to Christians; for the matter in question bears on the Christian excellence of Demetrius (Lücke); the restriction to those who knew him, is self-evident, and hence otherwise than in 2 Jno. 1. Limiting it to the brethren vv. 5, 7, 10 (Ebrard), or extending it to Jews and Gentiles (Oecumenius), cannot be done; there is nothing to warrant either construction; the former would require a further qualification, the latter is limited to his congregation by the context.—Καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας imports a personified and independent testimony running parallel with that of the πάντες, equal to it, real, and the truth itself giving that testimony. Hence we cannot agree with the explanation of Huther who thinks that the Apostle wanted to give prominence to the circumstance that the good testimony of all was not founded on their human judgment, in the testimony of the ἀλήθεια dwelling in them, and refers to Jno. xv. 26, 27. There the truth does not bear testimony concurrent with, and outside of the πάντες, but in them and out of themselves. We ought rather to think with Düsterdieck of the walk and conversation of Demetrius, in which the ἀλήθεια dwelling in him, shows itself as vital and bearing testimony to him; he is an image of the truth, which is personified in him, in his walk and nature. It is not sufficient to think here only of the *res ipsa*, or *res ipsæ*, the reality (a Lapide, Grotius, Beausobre); the Divine Truth is the witness here. [Alford reproducing, and, as so often, improving on Düsterdieck: "The objective Truth of God, which is the Divine rule of the walk of all believers, gives a good testimony to him, who really walks in the truth. This witness lies in the accordance of his walk with the requirement of God's Truth. It was the mirror in which the walk of Demetrius was reflected; and his form, thus seen in the mirror of God's Truth, in which the perfect form of Christ is held up to us (1 Jno. ii. 6; iii. 3, 16), appeared in the likeness of Christ: so that the mirror itself seemed to place in a clear light his Christian virtue and uprightness, and thus to bear witness to him."—M.]

But we also bear testimony.—John adds now his own testimony, as a third [and independent testimony—M.]; καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ makes this testimony of the Apostle very emphatic. Cf. notes on 1 Jno. i. 3.

And thou knowest that our testimony is true.—The reference is only to the personal testimony of the Apostle; Grotius explains erroneously: "*alii, qui Ephesi sunt.*" Cf. Jno. xix. 35; xxi. 24. Gaius knows and values it as a true and reliable testimony; not however because of the episcopal, apostolical and canonical dignity of John (a Lapide), but because of his personal truthfulness.

ETHICAL.

1. Outward prosperity, and more especially physical health, are of sufficient value to become the objects of a Christian wish in the form of intercession, but must always be subordinated to the health, or rather by Divine grace to the recovery of the soul walking in the truth of God. A parallel passage is 2 Cor. xii. 7 (σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί) cf. v. 9—(ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου, ἡ γὰρ δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται).

2. The greatest joy of the servants of Christ is, not to labour in vain in their congregations, though they labour for nothing (v. 4).

3. Participation in the work of missions is the sacred duty of individuals (vv. 5—8) as well as of Churches (v. 10), and a life-token of the truth in them (vv. 8, 11). Missionaries are objects of Christian love.

4. Ambition destroys the efficiency and position of men, so that they not only work evil themselves, but also hinder good.

5. Church-visitation is an official work, derived from the Apostolical Church.

6. We should look to and imitate in our walk and conversation those who have a good testimony in truth, not those who err and commit sin.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Compare Ethical.—Health is the foundation of all human activity. A sickly man cannot even think healthily. Men would be surprised, if they were able to take such a survey, to find how many of the things which have filled the world with feuds and laden with errors, may be traced back

to a disordered stomach. Who would go to sea in a leaky vessel?

STARKE:—Christians should bless and greet one another, wish one another good, pray for one another, so that all of us may be benefited.—There is none so weak but that he may be of use to others; though it be done only by wishing and praying, yet it is a great service.—A faithful teacher may be known by this token, that he rejoices over the spiritual growth of his hearers and others, and thanks God for it.—The evangelical truth is not still, it walks and causes those to walk who have it.—The natural life is not concluded with one step; sure, the spiritual life is a constant progression unto death.—Preachers have anxiety and toil in their ministry, they meet with hatred and envy, opposition and persecution, mockery and derision, but their joy in the fruits of their labour overcomes all the rest.—Would that all evangelical ministers might become zealous and imitators of the holy men of God, who have faithfully performed the work of the Lord. Let every one be of good cheer and courage in the discharge of his duty and he will be exalted to their society in heaven.—He who seeks only temporal and transitory things in the ministry is an antichrist and brings shame on the name of Christ.—It is very injurious to the course of the Gospel, if its servants seek only their own advantage; this makes more atheists than Christians.—Those who while exhorting others to the practice of godliness, include themselves, not only set a higher value on their exhortation, but also render it more telling and efficacious.—Those who receive the servants of Christ, receive Himself. Should we then not eagerly long to receive Him in His members? He will richly pay for His entertainment.—He that is of the truth and loves the truth must seek to further it in every possible way; this is the mark of a true one.—Be not surprised if thou findest no room with the clear truth among false teachers and prophets; for Christ Himself and His Apostles did not find it.—When loose talkers have exhausted words and proofs, they forthwith have recourse to detraction, slander and abuse.—Devilish malice—not to do good yourself and actually to hinder others who would do good.—False teachers are opposed to the children of God and avoid their company; but this very course shows plainly that they are not the children of God.—Heretics and false teachers foster not only errors of the understanding, but these are also allied to perversity and a malicious will.—The knowledge of the letter [of the Scriptures], is vastly remote from illumination.—He who does not see God by faith here, will not see Him in glory hereafter.—Benefits which have been shown to us, should be publicly acknowledged.

HEUBNER:—Here we are reminded of the double health. How rarely do we ask after the health of the soul: it is thought unbecoming, and yet it is the most important matter.—Let the sick in body be specially anxious for the health of the soul (2 Cor. iv. 16).—Spiritual paternal joys may compensate us for the want of bodily ones (2 Cor. i. 14; 1 Thess. ii. 19).—Where do we now find a congregation interested in the spiritual condition of another congregation?—The exhibition of love to the messengers of the Gospel, is a duty we owe to the Gospel itself. Such love exalts the praise of Christianity and of the Church.—Diotrephes probably turned them away as vagabonds. There were of course those who went begging in the name of the Gospel, idle begging brothers [*Grussbrüder*], like the *μητραγύρται* among the heathen went begging in the name of Mother Cybele.—The hatred of strange, calling and visiting Christians which is also found among clergymen, proceeds from a secret, wicked malice; they do not want strangers to become acquainted with the condition of their congregation, or to bring the Gospel which they themselves do lack; they are afraid of being eclipsed and of having their credit impaired (1 Thess. ii. 16).—Demetrius is so faithful and simple that the truth itself commends him in speaking forth from him. This is the best commendation, which we can have through ourselves and through faith (2 Cor. i. 12).—You cannot give a testimonial to others, unless you have out of themselves [*i. e.*, from their life and conversation.—M.] a testimony of the truth.

BESSER:—Hospitality was a conspicuous virtue of the first Christians, and St. Paul enumerates it among the qualities of an unblamable bishop (1 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 8). Every parsonage, yea, every Christian house was a home to travellers, where expelled brethren, or brethren travelling as evangelists met with hospitable welcome.—Instead of causing his name (*Diotrephes*, one nursed by Jupiter, the great mythological god of the heathen) to be mistaken and of becoming a *Theotrephes*, one nursed by God, he continued in the captivity of the love of the world.—The elder would not have admonished a confirmed obdurate man.—When a Diotrephes desired to be highly esteemed, a John had to be little esteemed. Where it is impossible to obey the law of God, there we ought not to be possible.

THE CONCLUSION.

vv. 13, 14.

13 I had many things to write,[1] but I will[2] not with ink and pen write[3] unto thee:[4]
14 But I trust I shall shortly see thee, and we shall speak face to face.[5] Peace *be* to
thee. *Our* friends[6] salute thee. Greet the friends[7] by name.[8]

Verse 13. [1] A. B. C. Cod. Sin. read: γράψαι σοι.
[2] B. C. Cod. Sin.: οὐ θέλω. The reading οὐκ ἐβουλήθην in A. originated from 2 Jno. 12, and like οὐκ ἤθελον formed after it.

[3] B. C. Cod. Sin.: σοι γράφειν; A: γράφειν σοι.
[[4] German: "I should have much to write unto thee, but I will not write unto thee with ink and pen."—M.]
Verse 14. [[5] German: "But I hope soon to see thee, and we shall speak mouth to mouth."—M.]
[6] B. C. G. K. Cod. Sin. read: φίλοι; A. ἀδελφοί. [German: "The friends salute thee."—M.]
[7] Several unimportant Codd. read ἀδελφούς instead of φίλους.
[8] G. inserts ἀμήν.—A. B. Cod. Sin. have the subscription: Ἰωάννου γ. The usual additions occur here and there, but are not sufficiently authenticated.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Close of the Epistle. vv. 13, 14.

Ver. 13. **I should have much to write to thee.**—Πολλά, emphatic, placed first. The Imperfect εἶχον without ἄν, is idiomatic Greek and must be rendered in the Subjunctive in German. See Winer p. 283 sqq.; [The objection to the rendering of E. V. "I had many things to write" is that the Apostle does not advert to the past but to the present. So Huther 2d ed. "I should have much to write" brings out this shade of thought in English.—M.].

But I will not write unto thee with ink and pen.—Cf. 2 Jno. 12.

Ver. 14. **But I hope, soon to see thee.**—The contrast to writing, for which the Apostle has no further inclination (Düsterdieck), is oral intercourse which he hopes soon to realize.

And we shall speak mouth to mouth.—The Future λαλήσομεν denotes the assurance of hope. The object is πολλά v. 13, and the particulars indicated in the Epistle.

Greetings v. 14.

Ver. 14. **Peace be to thee.**—The greeting of the Apostle to the beloved Gaius. As at the beginning of the Epistle the simple χαίρειν is not sufficient for the fulness of the Christian greeting, so at the close the common ἔῤῥωσο (Acts xxiii. 30; xv. 29) is displaced by richer and deeper forms. There the wish of peace is most appropriate (Gal. vi. 16; Eph. vi. 23; 1 Pet. v. 14; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Rom. xv. 33 and al.), because peace may be regarded as the sum-total of the Divine gifts of grace in Christ (Luke. ii. 4; Jno. xiv. 27) as N. de Lyra correctly explains it: "*Pax interna conscientiæ, pax fraterna amicitiæ, pax superna gloriæ*" (Düsterdieck). [Alford: "Remember our Lord's legacy, Jno. xiv. 27; and His greeting after the resurrection, εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, Jno. xx. 19, 26."].—Joy moreover is health of the soul.

The friends salute thee.—Bengel: "*Rara in N. T. appellatio, absorpta majori fraternitatis. Errant philosophi, qui putant amicitiam non instrui a fide.*" Jno. xv. 15. The expression suits a purely private Epistle, written on purely personal relations (Lücke). Bede: "*Amicis gratiam pacis mandat et salutis et per hæc Diotrephen ceterosque veritatis inimicos a salute et pace vestra monstrat extraneos.*" Among the ἀδελφοί, which are generally saluted (Phil. iv. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; Eph. vi. 23), John, according to 2 Jno. 9–11, probably included Diotrephes, because he acted only as an *ambitiosus*, but does not seem to have been wrong and erred in the doctrine of Christ's incarnation; but he and his party were not φίλοι to the Apostle, like Gaius and Demetrius. Cf. Jno. xi. 11; Acts xxvii. 3.

Greet the friends by name.—Κατ' ὄνομα=ὀνομαστί (Jno. x. 3); Bengel: "*Non secus ac si nomina eorum præscripta essent.*" The greetings, and especially those by name, have so deep an import and so great a value, that Paul fills a whole chapter of his Epistle to the Romans (ch. xvi. 1–24) with them, and often adds a series.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Starke:—It is not advisable to confide every thing to the pen; many things may be better and more effectively stated orally than in writing.—It is not a small benefit, if the children of God may visit each other and delight in friendly conversation.—We are in the company of the holy men of God whenever we hear or read their writings.

Heubner:—We see, how even letters of friendship are hallowed by faith. Everything should have the impress of our evangelical frame of mind. A mind wholly penetrated by the spirit of Christianity will not deny itself even in unimportant letters of friendship. Examples may be seen in Sailer's Christian letters of every century, in the letters of Luther, Tersteegen and John Newton.—The children of peace receive peace (Luke x. 5, 6).

Besser:—John greets the friends by *name;* he carries them all in his heart, and every one in particular. This is presbyter-fidelity.—

[Wordsworth:—The good pastor imitates that Good Shepherd, who "calleth His sheep by *name.*" Jno. x. 3.—M.].

THE

EPISTLE GENERAL OF JUDE.

BY

G. F. C. FRONMÜLLER, Ph. D.,

PASTOR AT KEMNATH, WÜRTEMBERG.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND REVISED GERMAN EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS ORIGINAL AND SELECTED,

BY

J. ISIDOR MOMBERT, D.D.,

RECTOR OF ST. JAMES'S CHURCH, LANCASTER, PA.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER, & CO., 654 BROADWAY.
1867.

Stereotyped by
JAS. B. RODGERS,
PHILADELPHIA.

THE EPISTLE GENERAL OF JUDE.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. CONTENTS AND ARRANGEMENT.

THE salutation and prayer of blessing in vv. 1. 2 is followed by a statement of the occasion and design of the Epistle, v. 3. The author's object is to exhort his readers to contend for the faith delivered unto them, against the daring perversions of deceivers, v. 4.—PART I., v. 5–16. The first section calls to mind the punitive justice of God, as illustrated by three leading examples, the first in the judgment on Israel (v. 5), the second in that on fallen angels (v. 6), and the third in that on the Gentiles in Sodom and Gomorrah (v. 7). The second section (v. 8–16) gives a more particular account of the deceivers and evil-doers referred to in general terms in v. 4; they exhibit the following characteristics: *a.* they defile the flesh; *b.* despise dominions; *c.* and blaspheme the majesties with fearful daring and blindness, vv. 8–10; they are compared to Cain, Balaam and Korah, and a woe is uttered on them, v. 11; their traits, one ever exceeding the other in detestableness, are then enumerated, vv. 12. 16. 19, with a parenthetical application to them of Enoch's ancient prophecy of the judgment, vv. 14. 15. Their voluptuousness, sensuality, selfishness, discontent, flattery, their spirit of murmuring and pride, their separating from the faith of the Church, and their gross carnality are described in the next place.—PART II., from v. 17, contains exhortations: *a.* to mindfulness of the words of the Apostles foretelling the appearance of such deceivers and scoffers, vv. 17. 18; *b.* to a firm foundation and continuance in the love of God, with constant prayer, and confident hope of the coming of Christ, vv. 20. 21; *c.* to loving compassion on the deceived, yet with hatred of evil, vv. 22. 23; and concludes with a doxology to God, which includes a strong consolation.

§ 2. THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

1. As to ancient testimony, we find that the Epistle had been received into the Canon of Scripture in the fourth century. Jerome acknowledges its genuineness, but observes that in consequence of a quotation from the apocryphal book of Enoch, it was rejected by most—their rejection of it was consequently not on objective, historical grounds. [The words of Jerome in *Catal.*, s. v. Judas are: "*Judas, frater Jacobi, parvam quidam, quæ se septem catholicis est, epistolam reliquit. Et quia de Enocho, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur; tamen auctoritatem vetustate et jam usu meruit, et inter sanctas scripturas computatur.*"—M.] Eusebius classes it with the *Antilegomena*, and adds that although many of the ancients did not mention it, it was nevertheless publicly used in most Churches. Origen refers to it in respectful terms [Comm. in Matt. xiii. 55. 56, t. x., § 17, "Jude wrote an Epistle of but few verses, yet fitted with vigorous words of heavenly grace"—M.], quotes it repeatedly, and only in

one place implies doubts as to its genuineness. [Comm. in Matt. xxii. 23. t. xiii., § 30, "if indeed the Epistle of Jude be received."—M.] It is mentioned in the old Muratorian fragment [*circa* A. D. 170, which reads: "*Epistola sane Judæ et superscripti Johannis duæ in Catholicâ* (Bunsen, *Anal. Ante-Nic.*, I., 152, reads "*Catholicis*") *habentur.*"—M.]. Clement of Alexandria commented on it, and expressly ascribed it to Jude. Tertullian says: "Enoch possesses a testimony in Jude the Apostle;" and Origen also calls him an Apostle in two places. Guerike, *Neutest. Isagogik*, p. 454. It is wanting in the old Syriac Peshito (but not in the MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford), Huther, p. 189. The testimony of the Fathers does not go further back. ["It is also quoted by Ephrem Syrus as Apostolic (*Opp. Syr.*, I., p. 136); by Malchian, a presbyter of Antioch, in a letter to the bishops of Alexandria and Rome (Eus., *H. E.*, vii. 30), and by Palladius, the friend of Chrysostom (Chrys., *Opp.*, xiii., *Dial.*, cc. 18. 20), and is contained in the Laodicene (A. D. 363), Carthaginian (397), and so-called Apostolic Catalogues, as well as in those emanating from the Churches of the East and West, with the exception of the synopsis of Chrysostom, and those of Cassiodorus and Ebed Jesu." Venables, in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, article, Ep. of Jude.—M.] The reason may lie in the shortness of the Epistle, in its affinity with 2 Peter, and as we shall convince ourselves, in its non-Apostolic origin. [To this must be added the quotation from an apocryphal book, which it contains.—M.] Summing up the testimony, we find that it preponderates in favour of the genuineness of the Epistle.

2. As to the *internal* grounds, the critics have been unable to establish any tenable objections. De Wette remarks that the authorship of Jude is neither affected by the use of the book of Enoch, nor by his probable acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans, nor by his harsh diction, which, nevertheless, betrays familiarity with the Greek language. Huther justly meets Schwegler's superficial assumption that vv. 17. 18 assign to the Epistle a post-Apostolic date, by saying that those verses by no means point to post-Apostolic times, for they rather suppose the readers of the Epistle to have heard the preaching of the Apostles, and that if, as Schwegler farther assumes, the Epistle was designed to serve the interests of Judaism against Paulinism, it ought certainly to appear somehow in the Epistle; a forger, moreover, would hardly have ascribed his writing to a man of such little prominence as this Jude. Although we must not attach undue importance to the arguments drawn from the silence of the Epistle, the circumstance, brought forward by Bertholdt, Guerike, Stier and al., that the author of the Epistle does not refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, is certainly worthy of great consideration; "if," says Stier, "the Epistle had not been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, this last, and next to the flood (which is only alluded to) most terrible of all the judgments and punitive examples of God, could not have been passed over in silence." The objections of Hofmann and Huther to this inference do not amount to much; more important would be the objection that a forger who did make mention of the judgment passed on Jerusalem, would not have been an adept at his trade. The former reason, in conjunction with other reasons, is at all events of considerable weight. The Epistle breathes forth a strictly moral spirit, it glows with zeal against error and vice, with loving care for the salvation of souls, and a profound reverence of God and His word. It is, therefore, every way worthy to have originated with a primitive Christian man, who stood so nearly related to the Lord. Cf. Herzog's *Real Encycl.*, art. *Judas.*—[Alford, Greek Test., IV., 447, well characterizes the main body of the Epistle as an impassioned invective, in the impetuous whirlwind of which, the writer is hurried along, collecting example after example of Divine vengeance on the ungodly, heaping epithet upon epithet, and piling image upon image, and, as it were, labouring for words and images strong enough to depict the polluted character of the licentious apostates against whom he is warning the Church; returning again and again to the subject, as though all language were insufficient to give an adequate idea of their profligacy, and to express his burning hatred of their perversion of the doctrines of the Gospel.—M.].—We must not suffer our judgment to be affected by the use of the apocryphal book of Enoch, of the tradition of Enoch and the *ascensio Mosis*, seeing that Paul also names the Egyptian magicians Jannes and Jambres, although nothing is said of them in the historical books of the Old Testament, 2 Tim. iii. 8; but rather admire the reserve with which the author of our Epistle uses the book of Enoch, which contains so much that is fantastic, and recognize in that reserve a leading of the Divine Spirit. Besides its decided dependence on the Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistle

of Jude contains many original traits, striking comparisons, *e. g.*, vv. 12. 13, characteristic delineation in few words, v. 19, wise and thoughtful exhortations, vv. 20–23. In proof of the author's originality, it must be mentioned that the twenty-five verses of this Epistle contain not less than eighteen ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, vv. 3. 4. 7. 10. 11. 12. 13. 15. 17. 19. 23. The author calls himself, v. 1, the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James.—Jude, as was shown in the Introduction to the Second Epistle of Peter, makes use of Peter's Epistle and acknowledges his entire dependence on him, cf. Jude 18. While Peter describes himself twice as an Apostle of Jesus Christ, and strengthens the weight of his exhortations by his Apostolic authority, Jude confines himself to the simple expression, "a servant of Jesus Christ." While Peter writes, "be mindful of the commandment of us, the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour" (2 Pet. iii. 2), Jude says: "remember the words which were spoken before of the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ," Jude 17. This affords striking proof that we must not look among the Apostles for the author of our Epistle.* He is, therefore, not Judas Lebbæus or Thaddæus, who is mentioned Jno. xiv. 22; Matt. x. 3; Mk. iii. 18, and is called twice *Judas Jacobi*, Lke. vi. 16; Acts i. 13; *Lebbæus*, from לֵב , and *Thaddæus*, תַּד=breast, are identical in meaning, and a comparison of the lists of the Apostles shows that *Judas Jacobi* is identical with *Judas Lebbæus* or *Thaddæus*. Although grammatically *Judas Jacobi* may also signify Judas, brother of James (Winer, pp. 218, 667), that construction is inadmissible in this connection, because in the Genitives used in the lists of the Apostles, we have invariably to supply *son*, not *brother*. Jude, the Apostle, was consequently a son of James, while our Jude was not an Apostle, and calls himself the brother of James. Ἀδελφός cannot well be taken here in another sense, there being no occasion whatever to render it cousin. But who are these two brothers Jude and James? James, the Apostle, the brother of John, cannot be meant here, for he was early martyred (Acts xii. 2), and probably had no brother besides John (Matt. iv. 21; xx. 20; xxvi. 37; xxvii. 56; Mk. i. xix. 20); nor can it be James the son of Alphæus, called the Little, of whose person and work we have no certain data, cf. Mk. xv. 40. He must be a well-known individual, doubtless the much revered head of the Church at Jerusalem, besides whom history knows no other distinguished man of that name. According to Hegesippus (2d century), in Eusebius (*H. E.*, 3, 19. 20), the emperor Domitian persecuted two grandsons of Jude, who was called a brother of Jesus according to the flesh, and had a brother named James. The same author mentions (Euseb., 2, 23) a James, a *brother of the Lord*, who along with the Apostles was the head of the Church at Jerusalem, and bore the surname "the Just," cf. ch. i. 12; ii. 1. The passage ch. iv. 22 is exegetically difficult, and perhaps to be interpreted by ch. ii. 23. Josephus informs us that the high-priest Ananus caused James, a brother of the so-called Christ, to be stoned (A. D. 62) and describes him as an altogether just man. The Fathers call him straightway bishop of Jerusalem; so Eusebius, Jerome, Nicephorus. See Winer, p. 525. The ancient Church, therefore, considered the Jude and the James here referred to, to have been the brothers of the Lord according to the flesh. How does this agree with the New Testament? Paul, in Gal. i. 19, introduces James, the Lord's brother, and evidently distinguishes him by that designation from the Apostle James the Less, and describes him as an Apostle in a *wider* sense, cf. 2 Cor. viii. 23; Rom. xvi. 7; Phil. ii. 25; Acts xiv. 14. Hence we need not be surprised that some of the Fathers, *e. g.*, Jerome, Epiphanius and Augustine, call him also an Apostle. But may not ἀδελφός here bear the sense of *cousin*, and relate to James, the

---

*** Note of Dr. Lange:—Having presented the opposite view in Comm. on Matthew, p. 255 (*American edition*), in the article, *Jacobus*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopædie*, and in the work *Apostol. Zeitalter*, I., p. 189, we take here occasion to observe that we consider differences of this kind in *historical* questions unavoidable in a Protestant Commentary on the Bible, and quite compatible with the unity in spirit and the unity on essential questions of faith, which is assumed to belong to the respective contributors to this work. Without giving rise to dogmatical scruples, such differences have the tendency of more strongly confirming even the more practical theologian in his opinion. We rejoice that the highly esteemed author of this section of the Commentary, besides the general blessed vocation of a beloved co-labourer, has throughout exhibited a desirable exegetical tact on many questions of this kind, *e. g.*, on Christ's preaching among the dead, in the First Epistle of Peter, on the fall of angels in the Second Epistle of Peter, ch. ii., and in this Epistle; and we are aware that he has recently found powerful support of his views in Riggenbach's *Leben Jesu*, and in our dear friend Van Oosterzee's *Comm. on Luke*, without shaking the firmness with which we hold a conviction, for which the reasons are given on the respective passages.**

son of Alphæus? Winer justly remarks that he could not, without confusion, have been called ἀδελφός, because Jesus had a brother according to the flesh of the same name. For the brothers and sisters of the Lord are introduced in Matt. xiii. 55; Mk. vi. 3. The names of the former were James, Joses, Simon and Jude, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 5; Matt. xii. 48; Jno. ii. 12; Acts i. 14. They are mentioned in connection with the mother of Jesus and Joseph, and are doubtless His actual brothers. For ἀδελφός in forty-nine passages of the New Testament signifies *actual* brother, while the sense *cousin* cannot be proved in a single passage. At first they did not believe in Him as the Messiah, Jno. vii. 5, but after the resurrection of Jesus, 1 Cor. xv. 7, and after the ascension, we find them forming part of the circle of believers, Acts i. 14. Among the brothers of the Lord, after they had become believers, James soon occupied a prominent position. He is introduced as the representative of the Jewish Christian tendency in the Mother Church, Acts xii. 17. His near bodily relation to the Lord, his pious life and austere habits soon raised him to Apostolical dignity. At the Apostolical Council on the obligatoriness of the law, his judgment proved decisive, Acts xv. 13. The council of elders gathered round him, ch. xxi. 18. Among the pillars of the Church, he is mentioned first (Gal. ii. 9), while otherwise Peter is the Prince of the Apostles. He is probably the author of the Epistle of James in the Canon; for the principles contained therein are in exact keeping with the notices of his life, reported by the Fathers, and he, like Jude, describes himself, not as an Apostle, but only as a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ (Jas. i. 1). If it be objected that Luke does not clearly distinguish the non-Apostolic James from the Apostle James, who is mentioned in Acts i. 13, we may answer with Huther that the then familiarity with all the circumstances of the case did not require such a distinction to be specially marked, and that the same holds good in the case of the two Philips, Acts i. 13; viii. 5. Wieseler's assertion that the Church at Jerusalem would not have recognized as its head any other than an Apostle, cannot be substantiated by any reasons. Our Jude was then the brother of that revered head at Jerusalem, and with him sustained the same family relation to the Lord. His not describing himself as the Lord's brother, like James in his Epistle, may have been the effect of modesty, or his sense of the spiritual relation in which he stood to Christ may have predominated over that of his physical relation, even as it was the case with our Lord Himself, Matt. xii. 48–50. Winer, Stier, Neander and al. hold that Jesus had actual brothers; for the opposite view, see Lange, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, Article *Jacobus*.—We have no reliable data concerning the life and work of Jude. He has generally been confounded with Judas Lebbæus, as James the Just with James, the son of Alphæus, cf. Cave, *Lives, Acts and Martyrdoms of the Holy Apostles*, p. 600, etc. [See note in Introduction to the Epistle of James, at the close of § 1, the Introduction to James and Jude in Alford's Greek Testament, *Prolegomena*, pp. 87, 188, and on the whole subject, my article, "Are James, the Son of Alphæus, and James, the Brother of the Lord, identical?" in the Princeton Review for January, 1865.—M.]

§ 3. READERS AND DATE OF THE EPISTLE.

It is singular that the readers are referred to only in very general terms, as the called who are sanctified in God the Father and preserved for Jesus Christ. No residence, no country, no particular account of the readers is given. Considering the dependence of this Epistle on the Second of Peter (see Introd. to 2d Ep. of Peter), it is probable that it was addressed to the same readers in Asia Minor, with a view to support and strengthen the exhortations and warnings of Peter. Others suppose that it was addressed to readers in Palestine, on account of the examples, comparisons and allusions used by our author; so Credner, Augusti, Arnaud. The adversaries whom Jude opposes are identical with those mentioned in 2 Peter; they are daring intruders, who abused the liberty of the Gospel to a fearful extent, and indulged in enormous excesses. De Wette supposes them to have been, not false teachers, but practical unbelievers, vv. 4. 8, scoffers, threatening to destroy the Church, on the one hand, by sensuality and dissoluteness, vv. 8. 10. 12, and on the other, by discontent, opposition and separatism, vv. 11. 16. 19. But the Epistle contains certain intimations of false doctrines by which they sought to excuse their false, immoral principles (vv. 4. 12), which rendered them so much the more dangerous. Dorner rightly observes that "the adversaries of Jude are not only practical perverts, but also

false teachers." This is also the view of Huther, who says that vv. 4. 8. 18. 19 intimate that they held Gnostico-antinomian views. Thiersch:—"Peter warns his readers against deceivers that should come; Jude, writing not long after Peter, warns his readers against the same deceivers, after they had come, with a distinct reference to the warnings and predictions of the Apostles." It must not be overlooked that Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, 3, p. 431) supposes Jude in his Epistle to have prophetically referred to the Carpocratians and similar sects; see Guerike, p. 455.—The beginnings of such a demoniac Gnosis, which sanctioned pagan licentiousness, stirred during the second half of the first century in the Churches of Ephesus, Pergamos and Thyatira. See Thiersch, p. 239.

As to the date of this Epistle, it must have been written during the interval between the death of Peter, who wrote his second Epistle, which was used by Jude, shortly before his death, and the destruction of Jerusalem, because it contains no reference to that event (see above). Jude saw the impudent libertinism, the appearance of which had been foretold by Peter, in its full development. "It is not credible," says Huther, "that Jude should have referred to the preaching of the Apostles, as past, if these were still in the prime of their Apostolical activity." The place where the Epistle was written cannot be determined.

The closer we draw to the last times of the Church, the more we ought to lay to heart this Epistle, which, as Meyer says, is a key-stone and an admonition of the most dangerous sins of the Church, and which, like the 2d Ep. of Peter, furnishes us with important disclosures relating to judgment and eternity. Capital applications of it to our own time are contained in Stier's Exposition.

§ 4. LITERATURE.

STIER, *the Epistle of Jude*, Berlin, 1850.

E. ARNAUD, *récherches crit. sur l'Epître de Jude*, Strasb. and Paris, 1851.

HUTHER, *Exposition of the Epistles of Peter and Jude.*

DE WETTE, *Brief Exposition of the Epistles of Peter, Jude and James.*—STARKE, RIEGER, RICHTER.

[Also:—

LAURMANN, *Not. Crit. et Comment. in Ep. Jud.*, Groningæ, 1818.

SCHARLING, *Jacob. et Jud. Ep. Cathol. Comment.*, Havniæ, 1841.

HERDER, *Briefe Zweener Brüder Jesu*, Lemgo, 1775.

AUGUSTI, WELCKER, BENSON, and MACKNIGHT, on the Catholic Epistles.

HÆNLEIN, *Ep. Jud. Græce, Comm. Critico et Annot. perpet. illustr.* Erlangen, 1804.

HASSE, *Brief Judæ, etc.*, Jena, 1786.

SCHMID, *Observatt. Sup. Ep. Cath. S. Jud. Hist. Crit. Theol.*, Lips., 1768.

WITSIUS, *Comment. in Metelemata Leidensia*, Basil, 1739, p. 359, 299.

PRICÆUS, *Johannes Comment. in Judæ Ep. in Comment. Crit. Sacr.*

For isagogical purposes consult, besides, E. ARNAUD (above), A. JESSIEN, *de Authentia Ep. Jud.*, Lips., 1821.

L. A. ARNAUD, *Essai Crit. sur l'Ant. cet.*, Strasb., 1835.

F. BRUN, *Introd. crit. à l'Ep. de Jude*, Strasb., 1842, and al.—M.]

[§ 5. SYNOPSIS OF PARALLEL PASSAGES IN THE SECOND EP. OF PETER AND THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

JUDE.	2 PETER.
3. πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος.	I. 5. πᾶσαν σπουδὴν παρεισενέγκαντες, cf. i. 15.
4. παρεισέδυσαν γάρ τινες, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριν μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι.	II. 1. παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι . . . καί πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις . . . . οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ.

6. ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν . . . . εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν.	II. 4. ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους.
7. Σόδομα καὶ Γόμοῤῥα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις . . . . ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας πρόκεινται δεῖγμα.	II.6-10. πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόῤῥας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν τεθεικὼς . . . . τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ πορευομένους.
8. κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσι, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσι.	II. 10. κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας . . . . δόξας οὐ τρέμουσι βλασφημοῦντες.
9. ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωσέως σώματος οὐκ ἐτόλμησε κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας, ἀλλ' εἶπεν, Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος.	II. 11. ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσι κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ Κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν.
10. ἄλογα ζῶα κ. τ. λ.	II. 12. ἄλογα ζῶα.

Compare also, Jude 11 with 2 Pet. ii. 15.
" 12. 13 with 2 Pet. ii. 13–17.
" 16 " " ii. 18.
" 17. 18 " " iii. 1–3.—M.]

[§ 6. THE BOOK OF ENOCH.

As this book is generally supposed to be referred to in v. 14, a brief account of it, compiled from Westcott's article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, and notices of Volkmar's article in the "*Zeitsschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*" for 1860, will be found useful to the readers of this Commentary.

1. *The history of the Book of Enoch.*—The Book was known to Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Anatolius, Clement of Alexandria and Origen; numerous references to it are found in the "Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs."—Tertullian quotes it as "not received by some, nor admitted into the Jewish canon ("*in armarium Judaicum*"), but defends it on account of its reference to Christ ("*legimus omnem scripturam ædificationi habilem divinitus inspirari*"). Augustine and an anonymous writer, whose work is printed with Jerome's, were acquainted with it; but from their time until the revival of letters, it was known in the Western Church only by the quotations in Jude, in the Eastern Church, some centuries later; considerable fragments of it are preserved in the *Chronographia* of Georgius Syncellus (*circa*, 792 A. D.); meanwhile, a report was current that the entire book was preserved in Abyssinia; in 1773, the traveller Bruce, on his return from Egypt, brought with him the complete Æthiopic translation of the entire book, the first detailed notice of which was not given until 1800, by Silvestre de Sacy, and the book itself was not published until 1821 in English, and in 1838 in Æthiopic, by Archbishop Lawrence, whose translation formed the basis of the German editions of Hoffmann (1833–38), and Gfroerer (1840) gave a Latin translation constructed from those of Lawrence and Hoffmann; but all these editions have been superseded by those of Dillmann, who edited the Æthiopic text from five MSS. (*Liber Henoch, Æthiopice*, Lipsiæ, 1851), and afterwards gave a German translation of the book, with a good introduction and commentary (*Das Buch Henoch . . . . von* Dr. A. Dillmann, Leipzig, 1853), which has called forth a number of Essays, the most important of which are those of Ewald and Hilgenfeld.

2. The Æthiopic translation is supposed to have been made from the Greek, as, with the exception of one passage quoted by Syncellus, it agrees in the main with the patristic quotations. But it is doubtful whether the Greek text was original, or itself a translation from the Hebrew. A Hebrew book of Enoch was known and used by Jewish writers till the thirteenth century, and the names of angels and winds are derived from Aramaic roots.

3. The book, in its present shape, consists of a series of revelations, supposed to have been given to Enoch and Noah, which extended to the most varied aspects of nature and life, and are designed to offer a comprehensive vindication of the action of Providence.

4. "In doctrine the book of Enoch exhibits a great advance of thought within the limits of revelation in each of the great divisions of knowledge. The teaching on nature is a curious attempt to reduce the scattered images of the O. T. to a physical system. The view of society and man, of the temporary triumph and final discomfiture of the oppressors of God's people, carries out into elaborate detail the pregnant images of Daniel. The figure of the Messiah is invested with the majestic dignity as "the Son of God," "whose name was named before the sun was made," and "who existed aforetime in the presence of God." And at the same time His human attributes as "the Son of man," "the Son of woman," "the Elect One,' "the Righteous One," "the Anointed," are brought into conspicuous notice. The mysteries of the spiritual world, the connection of angels and men, the classes and the ministries of the hosts of heaven, the power of Satan and the legions of darkness, the doctrines of resurrection, retribution and eternal punishment are dwelt upon with growing earnestness, as the horizon of speculation was extended by intercourse with Greece. But the message of the book is emphatically one of "faith and truth," and while the writer combines and repeats the thoughts of Scripture, he adds no new element to the teaching of the prophets. His errors spring from an undisciplined attempt to explain their words, and from a proud exultation in present success. For the great characteristic by which the book is distinguished from the later Apocalypse of Esdras (2d book), is the tone of triumphant expectation by which it is pervaded. It seems to repeat in every form, the great principle that the world, natural, moral and spiritual, is under the immediate government of God. Hence it follows that there is a terrible retribution reserved for sinners, and a glorious kingdom prepared for the righteous, and Messiah is regarded as the Divine Mediator of this double issue. Nor is it without a striking fitness that a patriarch, translated from earth, and admitted to look upon the Divine Majesty, is chosen as "the herald of wisdom, righteousness and judgment to a people who, even in suffering, saw in their tyrants only the victims of a coming vengeance." (Westcott, l. c.).

5. On the date of the Book the most conflicting views prevail. Lawrence, Hoffmann, Gfroerer, Wieseler and Gieseler suppose it to have been completed in the reign of Herod the Great; Lücke distinguishes two great parts, an older, written early in the time of the Maccabees, and a later, composed in the time of Herod the Great. Dillmann maintains the unity of the book, and assigns the chief part of it to an Aramæan writer of the time of John Hyrcanus (*circa*, 110 B. C.). Hilgenfeld places the original book about the beginning of the first century before Christ, which he supposes to have passed through the hands of a Christian writer, who lived between the times "of Saturninus and Marcion," who added the chief remaining portions, including the great Messianic section (cc. 37–71).—Volkmar (l. c.) tries to prove that the book is a production of the time of the sedition of Barchochebas (A. D. *circa* 132), and to have been written by one of the followers of Rabbi Akiba, the great upholder of that impostor. In that case, the book of Enoch was not only of Jewish, but of distinctly antichristian origin; which point, however, is not yet fully established. (See Alford, *Prolegg.*, p. 196). Westcott (l. c.) reaches the conclusion that, as a whole, the book "may be regarded as describing an important phase of Jewish opinion shortly before the coming of Christ."

6. The apocryphal character of the Book has never been doubted in the Church; Tertullian alone maintains its authority; Origen (c. *Cels.*, V. 54), Augustine (*de Civitate Dei*, XV., 23, 4), and Jerome (*Catalog. Script. Eccl.*, 4) describe it as apocryphal, and it is reckoned among the apocryphal books in the Apostolical Constitutions (VI., 16).—M.]

[[9] Lachm. has ἡμῶν after κοινῆς; Syr. Vulg. ὑμῶν; Sin. κοιν. ἡμῶν σωτηρίας καὶ ζωῆς.—M.]
[[10] ἀναγκὴν ἔσχον—"I had need," or "I felt constrained."—M.]
[[11] ἅπαξ, stronger than *once,—semel et simul, semel pro semper, i. e.*, once for all. See Lexica.—M.]
[Translate:—Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you concerning our common salvation, I felt constrained to write unto you, exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith that was once for all delivered unto the saints.—M.]

Verse 4. [[12] Sin. inserts καὶ before πάλαι. προγράφω—to write before, to declare, describe beforehand; *ordained* adopted by E. V. from Geneva V., is a very dubious rendering, and should be replaced by a less objectionable word; either of the above have the merit of literal translations of the Greek.—M.]
[[13] κρῖμα, condemnation, in the sense of punishment.—M.]
[14] Lach., Tisch. read χάριτα, which is the poetic Accusative.
Griesb. and al., following the best authorities, omit Θεὸν, which is doubtless a gloss, and found its way into the text because δεσπότης is used of the Father in all passages except 2 Pet. ii. 1; cf. Lke. ii. 29; Acts iv. 24; Rev. vi. 10. μόνος, moreover, did not seem to suit Christ.
[[15] [16] A. B. C., Sin. omit Θεὸν. Agreeing with this omission, translate: "For certain men have crept in privily, who have been long ago described beforehand (in the Holy Scriptures) for this condemnation, ungodly, perverting the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master, and Lord Jesus Christ."—M.]
[German:—"For some have crept in stealthily, who long since have been designated beforehand for this judgment, ungodly, who pervert the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and deny the only Master, God and the Lord Jesus Christ."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1. **Jude** (from יְהוּדָה, יָדָה, the praised, the confessor), different from Judas Iscariot and Judas Lebbæus, or Thaddæus. See Introduction.

A servant of Jesus Christ.—δοῦλος; used in a restricted sense of persons intrusted with an office in the Church, cf. 2 Pet. i. 1. Paul calls himself so, Rom. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; and James i. 1. Paul and Peter superadd their call to the Apostolate; Jude and James omit ἀπόστολος. The simple reason of this omission is that they were no Apostles. This omission is the more remarkable in the case of Jude, because, as has been shewn in the Introduction to 2 Peter, during the composition of this Epistle, he had before him the 2d Ep. of Peter, and especially also its introductory sentences. If the author of this Epistle and Judas Thaddæus, the Apostle, were identical, the silence he observes concerning his Apostleship would be unaccountable.

Brother of James.—Of that James, who was a brother of the Lord according to the flesh, and author of the Epistle that bears his name. See Introduction. Both are silent concerning their fraternal relation to the Lord. Why? Both may have remembered His words: "Who is my mother and who are my brethren?" Matt. xii. 49. A servant of Christ is really a nearer relation than a mere brother after the flesh, cf. 2 Cor. v. 16. It is commonly said that modesty prompted Jude to call himself a brother of James and not a brother of the Lord (Bengel, Stier); but we ought not to forget that the recollection of that fraternal relation must have been very humiliating to him, for, although so nearly related to the Lord, he did not believe in Him for a long time, Jno. vii. 3–5. According to Huther, the words "brother of James" are not only intended to designate the individuality of the author (cf. Jno. xiv. 22), but also to justify his writing; they possibly intimate that this Epistle was destined for the readers of that of James, seeing they are not described in more particular terms. See Introduction.

To the called—Jesus Christ.—*To the called*, &c., greeting; κλητοί which is the principal word of the whole clause, signifies not only persons invited or bidden, but those in whom the Divine calling out of the world has already become efficient, 1 Pet. i. 15; ii. 9. 21; iii. 9; v. 10; 2 Pet. i. 3–10; called saints, 1 Cor. i. 2. 24; Rom. i. 6. 7; Gal. i. 6.

Ἡγιασμένοις ἐν. To those who, in communion with God the Father, have been acquitted from the guilt and punishment of sins, and made a beginning in the sanctification of the Spirit, cf. 1 Pet. i. 2.

Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις. Huther:—"The Part. Perf. simply denotes that which had taken place up to the time when the Epistle was written, but this condition must be conceived continuing according to the force of the Perfect tense." Cf. Winer, p. 286, sq.—So Stier:—"Jude conceives his readers as having been preserved until then." They are preserved from seduction and apostasy for Jesus Christ so that they are His possession, the reward of His sufferings, His glory and crown, enabling Him to say of them, "Thine they were and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word," Jno. xvii. 6. 12; 1 Pet. i. 5.

[Wordsworth;—"The evil angels are preserved or kept for judgment (2 Pet. ii. 4); the heavens are preserved or kept for fire; but ye are preserved or kept for Jesus Christ, as a peculiar people (1 Pet. ii. 9), and there is an everlasting inheritance preserved or kept in heaven for you."—M.]

VER. 2. **Mercy unto you—multiplied.**—ἔλεος. Instead of it, 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 2 have χάρις, while ἔλεος occurs in Gal. vi. 16; 2 Tim. i. 16, and in connection with χάρις 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. 1. 2; 2 Jno. 3; cf. 1 Pet. i. 3. It is the grace of God and Christ condescending to the helpless and miserable. Stier:—"We learn from the conclusion, v. 21, that Jude refers here particularly to the mercy or grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, for he connects therewith the love of God, and appropriately assigns to the peace of the Holy Ghost the place of a living centre." De Wette also explains ἀγάπη as the love of God to Christians, deeming the verb πληθυνθείη to be better suited to such an interpretation. On πληθυνθείη, cf. 1 Pet. i. 2. Bengel's note is: "a testimony of the Holy Trinity."

VER. 3. **When I gave all diligence, etc.**—πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιεῖσθαι. To use all diligence, to be earnest in something either inwardly in mind and purpose, or outwardly in the execution of an action. Peter has σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισφέρειν, 2 Peter i. 5, and σπουδάζειν, ch. i. 15. Here it de-

notes inward purpose. The *Part. Pres.*, as de Wette observes, expresses the author's action at the time he had occasion to write (cf. Winer, p. 406), but he seems to be wrong in supposing his writing to be already an action on the point of being executed. His opinion is, that Jude had been engaged on the composition of a longer and more comprehensive Epistle, (the loss of which we have to lament), when he was for the time called away from that work in order to write this present Epistle. His reference to Sherlock is inaccurate, for he only adverts to Jude's intention of writing more fully.

Concerning our common salvation.—He had desired to write concerning its acquisition, enjoyment and preservation. This exhibits a contrast to the *hortatory* Epistle which circumstances (the appearance of antinomians or some other cause unknown to us) constrained him to indite.

I felt the necessity, etc.—Ἔσχον ἀνάγκην, I had with me, I felt within me the necessity, I saw myself inwardly constrained, cf. Luke xiv. 18; xxiii. 17; 1 Cor. vii. 37; Heb. vii. 27; παρακαλῶν denotes the character and tone, as well as the scope and matter of the Epistle.

Ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι, to fight concerning and for a thing [metaphorically in the sense of earnestly contending for a thing.—M.]. Bengel: "There is a twofold duty, strenuously to fight for the faith against enemies, and to edify oneself in faith, v. 20; cf. Neh. iv. 16, etc." [ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι, *supercertare*, is to fight, standing upon a thing which is assaulted and which the adversary desires to take away, and it is to fight so as to defend it, and to retain it.—M.]

For the faith, πίστει, here the faith that is believed, objectively, the Gospel as v. 20; Gal. iii. 25; Rom. i. 5. We have here a reference to 2 Peter i. 1, whence it follows that πίστις there also must be taken objectively.

Once, not=at one time, formerly, but *once for all*, so that it continues thus forever, that it is liable to no changes, and that no new revelation is to be looked for. [Casaubon: "*To contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.* Divine words, few in number, but rich in meaning. If rightly understood and duly obeyed, these words would put an end to all modern controversies, and restore peace to the Church. Do we desire to know what the true faith is? St. Jude here tells us—that *which was once, and once for all delivered to the saints. Every* doctrine which can be shown to be *posterior* to that faith, is *new;* and every doctrine that is *new* is *false*."—M.]. "No other faith will be given." Bengel.

Delivered (communicated) not immediately by God, as Bengel interprets, but by the Apostles, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 21; 1 Cor. xi. 2. 23; xv. 3; Luke i. 2.

To the saints.—Cf. 1 Peter ii. 9; iii. 5; 2 Peter i. 21; iii. 2; Col. i. 2. 12; iii. 12; Philem. 5. 7; Heb. iii. 1; vi. 10; Eph. i. 1. 15. 18; ii. 19; iii. 8. 18. [Bengel: *Sanctis omnibus ex fide sanctissima*, v. 20.—M.]

VER. 4. **For certain men—condemnation.**—This verse supplies the reason of that necessity and of the contest which the readers are bound to maintain.

παρεισδύνειν, to enter by the side of, to creep in stealthily by a side-door. Those deceivers passed the right door, John x. 7, and like thieves and robbers entered by some other way into the fold of the Church, John x. 1. De Wette says rightly, that "it is not said that these men did creep in from without, but only, that their sentiments and habits were foreign to those of the Christian community, and that they ought not to belong to it." Similar are the expressions παρεισφέρειν αἱρέσεις, 2 Peter ii. 1, παρεισέρχεσθαι and παρείσακτος, Gal. ii. 4. Cf. 1 John ii. 19; 2 Tim. iii. 6.

["*Le mot* τινες *a quelque chose de méprisant, comme dans Gal.* ii. 12." Arnaud.—M.]

Οἱ προγεγραμμένοι. The Article is used emphatically with the Participle, if the participial character is to be made especially prominent, cf. Winer, p. 120. They are unknown, insignificant men, but they have long since been described in the word of God. προγράφειν, to write beforehand of one, to predict by the word and by types. Cf. Rom. xv. 4. The pregnant term denotes,

1. That they were described beforehand, *e. g.*, Ps. xxxv. 16; x. 4; xxxvi. 2; lviii. 4; Prov. xiii. 25, and typified in the people who lived at the time of the flood, in the people of Sodom, in the wicked persecutors of David.

2. They were beforehand appointed for judgment, not by an absolute predestination, but because of their wickedness, which God foresaw in the light of His omniscience. Isa. iv. 3; rendered by the LXX. οἱ γραφέντες εἰς ζωήν, might be compared with this passage and applied to the eternal purpose of God, compared with a book, as Calvin does, but Huther rightly observes that πάλαι, long since, from of old, forbids such an interpretation. It is this very word which renders all reference to the Epistles of Paul and Peter inadmissible, as Grotius sees here a particular allusion to 2 Peter ii.; it is doubtful whether, as Bengel maintains, there is here a reference to the Book of Enoch in the sense that Enoch predicted long before what afterwards became fixed in writing. [Alford thinks that the reference is to the Book of Enoch, cf. v. 17, but deems it probable that the warnings contained in the historical facts mentioned below, may also be meant.—M.]

For this condemnation, of which the Apostle [?] treats in the sequel, seeing it, as it were, already present. Κρῖμα, here a judgment of condemnation.—The corresponding passage in Peter is, "whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not," 2 Peter ii. 3. [Wordsworth: "The doom which they would incur, had been προγεγραμμένον, written public beforehand in the prophecy of Enoch (v. 14), and visibly displayed in the punishment of the Israelites (v. 5), and in that of the rebel angels (v. 6), and had been graven indelibly in letters of fire on the soil of Sodom and Gomorrah (v. 7.)

Since God is unchangeably just and holy, all who sin after the manner of those thus punished, must look for like punishment to theirs. They have been publicly designated beforehand for it, by the punishment of those whom they imitate in sin. Therefore, these false teachers cannot plead ignorance of the consequences of their sin.

and you will be without excuse, if you are deceived by them.

The false teachers here specially noted, were the Simonians, Nicolaitans and Ebionites."—M.]

Ungodly—lasciviousness, *i. e.*, according to Stier's explanation, those who refuse to know any thing of fear, submission and adoration. Men who, having torn themselves loose from God, the root of our life, show this in their life, cf. 1 Peter iv. 18; 2 Peter ii. 5; iii. 7; Jude 15; Rom. iv. 5; v. 6; 1 Tim. i. 9. Their ungodliness is described by two exhibitions: *a. They turn the grace of God into lasciviousness*; χάριν, not=evangelical doctrine, Christian religion (Calov, al.), nor=acquired life of grace (de Wette, who compares Gal. v. 4; 1 Peter v. 12), for the description which follows renders it highly improbable, that these men had received (although only in part, as Stier thinks) the first-fruits of the Spirit in conscious regeneration. But it is the grace offered to them in baptism, in calling, in the preaching of the word, in Holy Scripture, acquired for them by Christ and now ready for their acceptance. They take hold of it, but put it in the wrong place, viz., there where the law ought to be, this is the force of μετατιθέναι; instead of using it as an incentive to holiness, they employ it as a cloak of maliciousness, 1 Peter ii. 16, as a passport of unrighteousness, Rom. vi. 1. 2; 2 Peter ii. 19; Gal. v. 13. They draw the daring conclusion: Because God is so merciful, because Christ has redeemed us from sin, because this and that sin have been passed unpunished, therefore we need not be so particular concerning sin, cf. Sir. v. 8, sq.; Heb. vii. 12. Of course they thereby do not change the nature of grace, but only deprive themselves of its salutary effects. [They change the state of grace and Christian liberty into a state of moral licence and wantonness; so Alford. Bede: "*Hanc ejus gratiam transferunt in luxuriam, qui nunc tanto licentius et liberius peccant, quanto minus se vident asperitate legis de admissis facinoribus examinari.*"—M.]

Τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Huther: "An expression of the sense of adoption," not exactly, as Bengel maintains, in opposition to the ungodly.

Εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 7. 18.

And deny the only Master, God and the Lord Jesus Christ.—μόνον δεσπότην Θεόν. [See note 14 in App. Crit.—M.]. If Θεόν were a genuine reading, the most natural construction would be this: They deny the Father and the Son (although even in this case the sole reference to Christ would be possible), for the want of the Article would be no objection to it, because it might be omitted on account of ἡμῶν, cf. Winer, pp. 141. 142. Even without the probably false reading Θεόν, δεσπότης may be applied to the Father, κύριος to the Son, like in Titus ii. 13, according to the doctrine of Paul, μέγας Θεός relates to the Father, σωτήρ to the Son; but the comparison of 2 Peter ii. 1, which Jude had before him, shows that the two predicates are to be understood of Christ. While Peter declares Christ to be the Lord that bought even these deceivers with His own blood, Jude infers therefrom that He is their only legitimate Lord, not as contrasted with the other persons of the Godhead, but with foreign lords, who rule over and in them. Isa. xxvi. 13. This view of the passage is not affected by μόνος, which is generally attributed to the Father, and κύριος retains its ordinary and usual meaning. Huther, on the other hand, understands δεσπότην of the Father, and cites Enoch xlviii. 11: "They denied the Lord of the spirits and His Messiah," cf. 1 John ii. 22; but this quotation is fully counterbalanced by that of 2 Peter ii. 1.

[Alford applies δεσπότην to the Father, and argues:

1. That in every other place δεσπότης is used of God, cf. Luke ii. 29; Acts iv. 24; Rev. vi. 10; Jer. iv. 10.

2. That the addition μόνος seems to bind this meaning to it here.

3. That the denial of God by disobeying His law is the epexegetic resumption of the last clause.

4. δεσπότην καὶ κύριον are hardly distinguishable if both applied to Christ. On these grounds he agrees with Huther in regarding the rejected Θεόν as having been, although a gloss, yet a true one; and would remind the reader, once for all, that the reference of any term in the parallel place of 2 Peter, is no guide for us here, seeing that it belongs to the extremely curious relation of the two passages to each other, that many common terms are used in different senses.—M.]

Deny, see 2 Pet. ii. 1. The reference here is according to the description of those deceivers, more especially to their practical denying (so de Wette and Huther). Even the book of Enoch (lxvii. 8. 10; xci. 7) connects in the case of the ungodly the denial of the Lord of the spirits with voluptuousness.

[DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.]

[Ver. 3. "The faith is that system of truths revealed in the Holy Scriptures concerning the dispensations of the God, whom we adore, and into whose name we were baptized, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, three Persons, one God. These truths are proposed to us as the ground of our hope, our comfort, and our joy; as the principles on which the conduct of life is to be framed, accepted and rewarded. We receive the revelation, which contains the truths, upon that plenary and satisfactory evidence vouchsafed us of its authenticity, and we receive the truths, which it contains, on the authority of the Revealer. The different articles of our belief, dispersed in the Scriptures, were very early collected into summaries styled creeds, recited at baptism, and constituting thenceforward the badge and test of a man's profession. By a formulary of this kind the catechumen himself was instructed; "the faith once delivered" was transmitted down to posterity; the members of the spiritual society were kept together; the doctrines, by them believed and taught, were made known to the world, and distinguished from a multitude of heterogeneous and erroneous opinions, by them disclaimed; a connection with the maintainers of which would justly have brought discredit on themselves and their cause. For these reasons the use of creeds appears to

have at first been introduced and since continued." Horne.—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The calling of God the beginning of all His exhibitions of grace.—General and particular calling. Man's relation thereto.—Believers the possession, the spoil, the crown and reward of the Lord Jesus.—The Christian life a state of constant warfare.—The great danger of abusing grace.—The manifold denial of the Lord that bought us.

STARKE:—Every Christian should be an honest Judas; *i. e.*, a confessor, confessing Christ before the world according to the belief of his heart in word and life, that Christ may confess him before His Father. Mtt. x. 32.—Would that all Jews were such, or would soon become such. Rom. x. 1.—It is not enough for a man's salvation that he receive the call of grace, he must accept it, become holy and persevere in grace, Is. lv. 3: Rev. ii. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 1. 2.—Christianity is never at a stand-still, but ever growing and progressing, 1 Thess. iii. 12; iv. 1. —We must fight for our faith against our lusts, the world and Satan; otherwise we shall not receive the end of faith, the salvation of our souls, 1 Pet. i. 9.—God has prepared His grace for the penitent that are of a broken heart, Is. lxi. 1, and namely for their consolation and amendment. This truth ungodly men reverse in that they accord grace to the impenitent, not for their amendment, but for their security.—The more secret an enemy, the more dangerous, Ps. lxiv. 6. 7.—Sinning in reliance upon grace is the poison which corrupts and kills the greatest number of souls. The Gospel is to them a savour of death unto death.—Those who deny Christ that bought them with His blood, are the servants of the devil, 1 Jno. iii. 8.

K. H. RIEGER:—Even evil times should neither make us evil and harsh, nor cause us to fall from our first love. Whatever remains to be done, must be done by love, 1 Thess. ii. 7.—Contending without one's own edification would amount to quarrelling. Edification without contending is indifference which does not sufficiently consider what edifying is. Cf. v. 20.—The devil introduces his children of malice among the children of the kingdom, even as tares creep in among good wheat and at first cannot be distinguished from it. His lies always spring up under some borrowed rag of truth.

STIER:—In the accredited, sealed word of the Scriptures we have the authentic deposit of the precious jewel of the first testimony of faith, which deposit is to be preserved and necessarily becomes the permanent rule of faith.—The faith delivered to Christendom is the treasure for the unimpaired possession and enjoyment of which we must fight against hostile powers.—God has a holy purpose of justice in that He gives up to the deception of powerful error all those who would not believe in the truth with all their heart, as they ought, 2 Thess. ii. 8–12.—Those who will not obey Christ, to the Christ whom they ought and must know as the Lord, have also no God in heaven, no gods (Ps. lxxxii.; Exod. xxii. 28) on earth, and become through and through rebels and insurrectionists.

[BARROW:—Some vehemency (some smartness and sharpness) of speech may sometimes be used in defence of truth, and impugning errors of bad consequence; especially when it concerneth the interests of truth that the reputation and authority of its adversaries should somewhat be abased or abated. If by a partial opinion or reverence toward them, however begotten in the minds of men, they strive to overbear or discountenance a good cause, their cause, so far as truth permitteth, and need requireth, may be detected and displayed. For this cause particularly may we presume our Lord (otherwise so meek in His temper, and mild in his carriage toward all men) did characterize the Jewish scribes in such terms, that their authority (being then so prevalent with the people) might not prejudice the truth, and hinder the efficacy of His doctrine. This is part of that ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ πίστει, the duty of *contending earnestly for the faith*, which is incumbent upon us.—M.]

Sermon-Themes:

VER. 1. Spiritual fellowship with Christ.

VER. 3. The rule of faith. Zeal for the cause of Christianity. The faith once delivered to the saints, a depositum or trust, committed to the care of the Church. Civil government and religion.

Cf. on v. 4. CLAGET, NICHOLAS: The abuse of God's grace, discovered in the kinds, causes, punishments, symptoms, cures, differences, cautions, and other practical improvements thereof. 4to., Oxford, 1659.—M.]

VERSES 5–15.

CONTENTS:—Three examples of the punitive justice of God, typical of the judgment awaiting those deceivers, introduced as a warning, vv. 5–8; more particular description of their sins. An exclamation of woe, v. 11, followed by additional details of their character, and an application to them of a prophecy of Enoch.

5 I will[2] therefore[1] put you in remembrance, though ye[3] once knew this,[4] how that
the Lord,[5] having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed[6] them
6 that believed not. And the angels[7] which kept not their first estate, but left their
own habitation, he hath reserved[8] in everlasting chains[9] under darkness unto the

7 judgment of the great day. Even as[10] Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them
in like manner,[11] giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange[12] flesh,
8 are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Likewise[13] also
these *filthy* dreamers defile[14] the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities.[15]
9 [16]Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the
body of Moses, durst[17] not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord
10 rebuke thee. But these speak evil of those things[18] which they know not: but what they
11 know[19] naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. Woe unto
them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Ba-
12 laam for reward,[20] and perished in the gainsaying of Core. These are spots in your
feasts of charity,[21] when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear: clouds
they are without water, carried about[22] of winds; trees whose fruit withereth,[23] with-
13 out fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; Raging waves of the sea, foaming out
their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for
14 ever. And Enoch, also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied[24] of these, saying, Behold
15 the Lord[25] cometh with ten thousand of his saints,[26] To execute judgment upon all,
and to convince[27] all that are[28] ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which
they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard *speeches* which ungodly sinners
have spoken against him.

Verse 5. [1 δὲ, not—*therefore*, but—but.
Kühner: "δέ most generally has an adversative force, and hence can express every kind of contrast. In respect to its signification, it ranks like the Latin *autem*, between the copulative connectives (τέ, καί) and the adversative (ἀλλά, etc.), since it contains both a copulative and adversative force, and hence either opposes one thought to another, (adversative), or merely contrasts it (copulative). Hence it is very frequently used in Greek, where the English uses *and*. The new thought being different from the preceding is placed in contrast with it."
Winer (pp. 472. 473): "δέ NEVER means *therefore, then;* nor *for*, nor does it ever serve as a mere *copula* or particle of transition."—M.]

[2 βούλομαι, to wish, to desire. Its force ought to be brought out in a stronger form than the ambiguous "I will."—M.]

[3 ὑμᾶς. The force of the second ὑμᾶς is lost in E. V.; it is emphatic, and the emphasis ought to be brought out. "But I wish to remind you, you who . . ."—M.]

[4 εἰδότας has a *Present* sense. They know it *once for all, certainly, fully*. This thorough knowledge of theirs is the motive of Jude's reminding them. They know it *now;* not that they knew it once and have now forgotten it.—M.]

5 Lachm., Tisch. read εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα, ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς. So Vulgate. Stier says, that this would be unexampled, unintelligible, remarkable; that the dark Epistle had been much corrected and glossed. De Wette agrees with Lachmann, following A. B. C. and other authorities, but not in respect of Ἰησοῦς. [The reading πάντα is also sustained by Cod. Sin., several Cursives, Copt. Syriac. It is on many accounts preferable to τοῦτο.
Ἰησοῦς instead of Κύριος is the reading of A. B., several Cursives, Vulg., Copt., Sahidic, Æthiopic and Armenian verss.; also of Didymus, Cyril, Jerome, Cassian, and received by Griesb. and Lachmann. In point of doctrine, it agrees with that of Paul. Cf. 1 Cor. x. 1–11; Heb. iii. 7–19; iv. 1. 2.—M.]

[6 δεύτερον, the second time, again not *afterwards*, as in E. V. The *first* thing was deliverance, the second destruction. So Engl. Annot., Stier, Pelle, Huther, Wordsw., Lillie.—M.]

[German: "But I will remind you, you that have known this once, that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, for the second time destroyed those who believed not."
Translate: "But I wish to remind you, you who know all things once for all, that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, the next time destroyed those who believed not."—M.]

Verse 6. [7 ἀγγέλους. The omission of the Article here contrasts *angels* with *men*, of whom Jude has spoken in the previous verse. τοὺς μὴ κ. τ. λ. specifies the particular class of angels in question.—M.]

[8 δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις, Abl. instr. "With everlasting bonds." "E. V., 18 times out of 20 (the other exception being Mk. vii. 35, *string*) has *bands* or *bonds*." Lillie. Calvin: "*Quocunque pergant, secum trahunt sua vincula et suis tenebris obvoluti manent. Interea in magnum diem extremum eorum supplicium differtur.*" Milton, Par. Lost. IV., 75: "*Which way I fly is hell; myself am hell.*"—M.]

[9 "τετήρηκεν, says Huther, stands in sharp opposition to μὴ τηρήσαντας." Hence the same word ought to be used in order to bring out the opposition.

[German:—"And the angels that kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath kept for the judgment of the great day with everlasting bonds under darkness."

[Translate:—"And angels that kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath kept with everlasting bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day."—M.]

Verse 7. [10 ὡς connected with ὑπομνῆσαι, viz.: "I wish to remind you . . . . *how* Sodom and Gomorrah, etc."—M.]

[11 τὸν ὅμοιον τούτοις τρόπον—in like manner as these men.—M.]

[12 ἑτέρας. "Nowhere else does E. V. translate ἕτερος, which occurs 98 times, by *strange*." Lillie.—M.]

[German:—"How Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities around them, having whored themselves out in like manner as these, and gone after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

[Translate:— . . . . having given themselves over to fornication in like manner as these men, and gone after other flesh, are set forth, etc.—M.]

Verse 8. [13 μέντοι, omitted in E. V., has adversative force, and should be rendered by some such word as *yet, however*, etc.—M.]

[14 μὲν . . . . δὲ, on the one hand, on the other. Calvin:—"*Notanda autem est antithesis, quum dicit* CARNEM CONTAMINARE: *hoc est, quod minus præstantiæ habet, dehonestare: et tamen spernere quasi probrosum, quod in genere humano maxime excellit.*"—M.]

[15 Cod. Sin. has κυριότητας.—M.]

[German:—"Now in like manner these dreamers also defile the flesh, *and* thus (*dabei*—therewith, at the same time) reject the dominion and revile the majesties."

[Translate:—"In like manner, however, these dreamers also on the one hand defile the flesh, on the other reject lordship and speak evil of dignities."—M.]

Verse 9. [16] Lachm. reads: ὅτε Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος τότε τῷ διαβόλῳ; but we prefer, with Stier, the common reading.

[[17] οὐκ ἐτόλμησε, *did not dare*, or *dared not*, better than *durst not* of E. V. The former is Lillie's rendering, the latter that of German version.—M.]

Verse 10. [[18] ὅσα has distributive force, and is variously rendered *quæcunque* (Vulg.), *quotquot* (Laurm.), *quæ et quanta* (Wordsw.), *omnia quæ* (Bengel), whatsoever things (Kenr., Lillie).

ὅσα μὲν . . . . ὅσα δὲ state an antithesis, which should be brought out.—M.]

[[19] ἐπίστανται is stronger than οἴδασι of the first clause, cf. Mk. xiv. 68; the former is *to understand*, the latter, *to know*.

[German:—"These, on the contrary, revile those things which they know not; but those things which they understand naturally, as the brute beasts, even therein do they ruin themselves."

[Translate:—"These, however, on the one hand, speak evil of whatsoever things they know not, on the other, whatsoever things they understand naturally, as the brute beasts, in those they corrupt themselves."—M.]

Verse 11. [[20] καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ; the construction of this difficult clause, which has the most weighty authorities, is that which takes τῇ πλάνῃ as a Dative of the direction *in* which (Dodd., Mack. Thom., Scott, Stier, Peile, Wahl, Robins., Wordsw., Lillie), and μισθοῦ=ἕνεκα μισθοῦ, or Oec.'s κέρδους χάριν; (so Wic., Tynd., Cran., Reims, vss.; Grot., Beng., Bloomf., Stier, Winer, Robins., Wordsw., Lillie. al.). See Winer, p. 219, § 30, 10, e.—M.]

[German:—"Woe unto them, for they have walked in the way of Cain, and the error of Balaam with his hire has drawn them along, and in the gainsaying of Korah they have perished."

This can hardly be called a translation; it is a paraphrase, which takes considerable liberty with the grammar of the original. Translate:—"Woe unto them, for in the way of Cain they walked, and in the error of Balaam they rushed headlong (Beng.: '*effusi sunt, ut torrens sine aggere;*' Green, Lillie as here), and in the gainsaying of Core they perished."—M.]

Verse 12. [21] Lachm. reads αὐτῶν instead of ὑμῶν, and supplies οἱ before ἐν ταῖς. Stier also prefers on internal grounds the reading "in their love-feasts." ἀπάταις is less authentic here than in 2 Pet.

[οἱ ἐν ταῖς, A. B., Cod. Sin., G., Syr., Lachm., Tisch.

Cod. Sin. has the reading οὗτοι εἰσιν γογγύσται μεμψίμυροι κα(**κατα)τὰσ ἐπιθυμίασ αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, which Tischendorf characterizes thus: ** *improb.* γογγ. *usque* πορ.—M.]

[22] Tisch., al. read παραφερόμεναι, driven fast. The sense is not essentially different [*i. e.*, from περιφερόμεναι, which is certainly an unauthentic reading. A. B. C., Sin., Griesb., Scholz, Lach., Tisch., Words., Alford, Lillie are all in favour of the former. Cod. Sin. has παντί ἀνέμῳ παραφερόμεναι.—M.]

[[23] Sin., φθινοπωρικὰ for φθινοπωρινὰ.—M.]

[German:—"These are spots in your love-feasts, carousing together without fear, feeding themselves, clouds without water, driven fast by winds, late-autumnal trees, unfruitful, twice dead, uprooted."

[Translate:—"These are rocks in your love-feasts, carousing together without fear, feeding themselves, clouds without water, borne along by winds, late-autumnal trees, unfruitful, twice dead, uprooted."

For reasons see below in *Exegetical and Critical*.—M.]

Verse 14. [[24] προφήτευσε δὲ καὶ τούτοις (Sin., προεπροφήτευσε). "But for these also prophesied Enoch," better than "But of these" (German), and E. V.—M.]

[[25] Sin., ὁ κύριος.—M.]

[[26] Sin., ἁγίων ἀγγελῶν. German inserts between brackets after myriads (of angels).—M.]

Verse 15. [27] Lachm., Tisch. read simply: ἐλέγξαι [following A. B., Cod. Sin., which latter has the variation: ἐλέγξαι πάσαν ψυχὴν; and omits afterwards ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν.—M.]

[28] αὐτῶν restored by Tischend. in his last edition, after A. B. G. K., while Lachmann omits it.

[German:—"To give judgment against all, and to convict all ungodly ones of all their ungodly deeds, wherein they have shown themselves ungodly, and of all the hard speeches, which the ungodly sinners have spoken against Him."

[Translate:—"To exercise judgment upon all, and to convict all the ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds, wherein they were ungodly (Lillie), and of all the hard speeches which sinners spake against Him."—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 5. **But I will remind you—believed not.**—This connects with 2 Pet. i. 12, although there the reference is not to historical facts, but to doctrines. In like manner the words, "you who know all things once for all" revert to that passage as well as to προγινώσκοντες, 2 Pet. iii. 17.—ἅπαξ τοῦτο (cf. Appar. Crit., N. 5). It is inadmissible to connect ἅπαξ with ὑπομνῆσαι, or to take it in the sense of once, formerly, from the beginning; it rather has here its usual meaning, you have heard it once for all and stamped it on your memory; you need not any new instruction on that head; but it is matter of urgent necessity for you to be reminded of it, earnestly to deliberate upon it, and to apply what has taken place to events as they occur. It is not related to the following τὸ δεύτερον. If we adopt the reading πάντα, all that is necessary is to connect it with the sequel, to the historical facts, and hence not to take it as at 1 Jno. ii. 20. [εἰδότας πάντα. Remembering that Jude wrote against the Gnostics (the men of knowledge), who laid claim to superior knowledge, and on that pretence beguiled their hearers into corrupt doctrines and licentious practices (2 Pet. i. 2. 3), the words εἰδότας πάντα seem to have an implied antithesis, and while affirming of his readers that they had all the knowledge necessary to their salvation (1 Jno. ii. 20), put them on their guard against the pretended superiority of knowledge of the Gnostics. See Wordsworth *in loc.*—M.]. —Huther says on the reading ὁ Ἰησοῦς that it unfolds the same view as 1 Cor. x. 4, and that the name of Jesus in this connection may be accounted for by the popular character of a parenetic Epistle.—τὸ δεύτερον neither=afterward, nor =on the contrary (Grotius). Forced is also the explanation of Winer, pp. 642, 648: "The Lord, after having delivered them, did, *on a second occasion* (when they were in need of His helping grace), refuse them His delivering grace and destroy them." Equally unnatural is that of Huther: "God did reveal Himself to His people in two ways, the first time as a Deliverer, the second time as Judge, that is in the latter instance as Judge of the unbelieving who did not trustfully and obediently rely upon His promise." Similarly Stier: "After God's deliverance and pardoning there is also a second time surely following in the case of the unworthy." No, it is said, He destroyed them the second time, and should be referred to two judgments of destruction, once, when the people, with the exception of a few, perished in the wilderness, and again to the Babylonish captivity, Numb. xiv. 23; 2

Chron. xxxvi. 16, etc. The corresponding passage in 2 Peter (ii. 2) specifies the example of the flood; Jude wished to select a still stronger example, exhibiting a two-fold destruction of the chosen people. Notwithstanding the former wonderful deliverance, the people were twice destroyed. Had this Epistle been written after the destruction of Jerusalem, Jude might have added a τὸ τρίτον. [Notwithstanding Fronmüller's emphatic assertion to the contrary, we feel constrained to advocate the view recommended in Appar. Crit., note 6. It is more telling in point of fact and more congruous in point of doctrine; it is perfectly sound in point of grammar, and the charge of its being forced and unnatural is arbitrary and unsupported by reasons.—M.]

Ver. 6. **And the angels—darkness.**—The allusion in 2 Pet. ii. 4 is here more fully explained. If it could be proved that Jude had before him the book of Enoch, which repeatedly adverts to the coming down of the angels in order to contaminate themselves with women, we should not be warranted to think here of the first fall in the world of spirits. But this presumption is not certain. See note on 2 Pet. ii. 4.

Their first estate.—Huther explains ἀρχή of the dominion, originally assigned to them; others (*e. g.*, Calvin, Grotius) of their original condition, estate, cf. Jno. viii. 44. Both ideas may be combined as Stier [and others] do. [In that case we have *primam dignitatem*, Carpz. al.—M.]

Their own habitation, not heaven in general, but their own dwelling of light assigned to them by the Creator. Their fall and guilt seem to have been the consequence of their leaving that habitation and arbitrarily going beyond the sphere allotted to them. There is no explicit reference to Satan, but μὴ τηρεῖν, which points to incitement from without, may allude to him. Delitzsch: "They made themselves at home on earth and exchanged the power belonging to their vocation in heaven with an earthly exhibition of power usurped for the sake of selfish sensual indulgence."

For the judgment of the great day, *i. e.*, for the last judgment at the end of the world; an amplification of 2 Pet. ii. 4; cf. Acts ii. 20; Rev. vi. 17; xvi. 14.

With everlasting bonds.—Peter has only "chains (bands) of darkness," cf v. 7. The book of Enoch has this variation: "Bind them for seventy generations under the earth until the day of judgment, then shall they be removed to the lowest depths of fire."

Under darkness.—De Wette: "In the depth of the under-world, in the abyss." Rev. xx. 2. 8. At the same time the reference to the inward, spiritual darkness of the love of evil, must not be overlooked. See 2 Pet. ii. 4. [Clement of Alex. says, "that the chains in which the evil angels are now confined, are the air near this earth of ours, ("*vicinus terris locus, caliginosus aër*), and that they may well be said to be *chained*, because they are restrained from recovering the glory and happiness they have lost."

Wordsworth: "This passage is cited by Origen in *Mtt. tom.*, XV., p. 693, and in *Rom. lib.* 3., vol. IV., p. 510, where he calls this Epistle *Scriptura divina*," *ibid. lib.*, V., p. 549.—M.]

Ver. 7. **How Sodom and Gomorrah**, etc.—To the two examples taken from the past history of Israel and the invisible world, Jude, again agreeing with Peter, adds a new example, taken from the heathen world, of a punitive judgment the consequences of which still remain.

The cities around them, an addition to 2 Pet. ii. 6. Admah and Zeboim. Deut. xxix. 23; Hos. xi. 8.

In like manner as these men, τούτοις may be connected with Sodom and Gomorrah, that is, the inhabitants of those cities; as the sin of those cities is generally known, it cannot be thought strange that it is indirectly adverted to. It is less known of the other two cities, hence the selection of this word. Bengel refers τούτοις to the false teachers, v. 4, but he thereby anticipates the thought of v. 8. The majority of modern expositors believe the reference to be to the fallen angels, who, according to the book of Enoch, sinned in like manner. See on 2 Pet. ii. 6. We cannot believe that Jude or Peter considered fables of apocryphal books, like those contained in the book of Enoch and the Gospel of the Twelve Patriarchs, and which cannot be substantiated by Gen. vi. to be true, (see Evangel. Kirchenzeitung, 1858, p. 35, sq.), although Jude refers to them and confirms some of their statements. [Bengel's construction, which is also that of Wordsworth and others, seems to be more natural and less artificial than that recommended by Fronmüller. The anticipation of the thought of v. 8, is no valid objection. Jude first points out the analogy in general terms and then develops it. The very sins of Sodom and Gomorrah were those of some of the Gnostic sects. See the description of the Nicolaitans in Iren. i. 20; Theodoret *haer. fab.*, 1. Epiphan. *haer.* 25.—M.]

ἐκπορνεύειν, although not used elsewhere in the New Testament, is of frequent occurrence in the LXX., where it is generally applied to spiritual whoredom, but also to physical in Gen. xxxviii. 24 for זָנָה. ἐκ is intensive, and denotes extravagant lust. The idea "transcending the limits of nature" belongs to what follows.

Gone after strange flesh, ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας;—ἀπέρχεσθαι ὀπίσω, to go after, literally, Mk. i. 20; then tropically. Peter uses the term πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω, 2 Pet. ii. 10. See note there. It is evident that this term cannot apply to angels, who have no flesh.

Are set forth, etc.; πρόκεινται [literally: lie before the eyes, *ante* (*oculos*) *jacent*.—M.] The parallel passage, 2 Pet. ii. 6, has a different turn, "having made [set, instituted—M.] them an example." There we have ὑπόδειγμα, here δεῖγμα. The Dead Sea is to this day a testimony of that catastrophe; ruins of the sunken cities were perhaps still visible in the days of Jude at low-water; but this is not the case now, although such a myth of travellers is occasionally circulated. See Zeller Bibl. Wörterbuch, p. 510.

Πυρὸς αἰωνίου should be construed with δίκην, (de Wette), not with δεῖγμα. Stier: "They suffer a punishment intended to serve as an example and type of eternal fire." Cf. Wisdom x. 7 [On the construction with δίκην, Wordsworth offers the following exposition: "As Sodom and Gomorrah suffer the vengeance of a *fire* that consumed them finally, so that they will never be

restored, as long as the world lasts, so the bodies and souls of the wicked will suffer, as long as they are capable of suffering, which, since they are immortal, will, as Tertullian says: "be *for-ever*," "*erimus iidem, qui nunc, nec alii post resurrectionem: Dei quidem cultores, apud Deum* SEMPER, *profani verò in pœnam aquè* JUGIS IGNIS *habentes est ipsâ naturâ ejus, divinâ scilicet, subministrationem* INCORRUPTIBILITATIS." Apol. 48.—M.]. De Wette says that "subterraneous fire is presumed to be beneath the sea that covers the cities." May this not be a false presumption?—ὑπέχειν, 2 Macc. iv. 48; 2 Thess, i. 9. [On the *Eternity of future punishment*, see Bp. Taylor's Sermon on Christ's advent to judgment, part III., ¿. 6.—M.]

VER. 8. **Now in like manner**, etc.—μέντοι has at once illative and adversative force. Now, in like manner, however—*i. e.*, without taking warning from those Divine judgments.

These dreamers also, refers back to v. 4. Ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, on account of μὲν and δὲ should be construed both with μιαίνουσι and ἀθετοῦσι. This sets aside various false interpretations, which make reference to voluptuous dreams, nocturnal pollutions, etc. As ἐνύπνιον differs from ὄνειρος in that the former denotes a confused state of soul, an abnormal influence of the imagination on the bodily organs, whereas the latter designates a clear and sometimes most significant dream, so ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι is designed to portray that state of the soul in which the *Ego* is controlled and held captive by the power of ungodly, sensual impulses. Stier: "Their inner man is benumbed, blinded, absorbed by gloomy visions, dreamy and holden with sleep. Cf. Is. xxix. 10.

[Bengel: "*Uno verbo* ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι *hominum mere naturalium indoles graphice admodum descripta est. Somnians multa videre, audire, etc., sibi videtur; concupiscentia agitatur, gaudio, angore, timore, rel. At nescit imperare sibi in isto statu: sed qualis est imago in somnio ex imagine orta, talis hominum illorum conditio. Hinc, omnibus licet rationis nervis adhibitis, concipere nequeunt, filios lucis vera libertate, in luci expergefactos, perfrui.*"

Hornejus: "*Tam insipientes sunt, ut quasi lethargo quodam sopiti non tantum impure vivant, sed etiam quæ non norunt tam audaciter vituperent.*"

Arnaud: "*Cependant ceux-ci, comme des gens qui agissent sans savoir ce qu'ils font, comme s'ils rêvaient, pour ainsi dire* . . . . ."—M.]

Defile the flesh, *i. e.*, their own and strange flesh. The idea has a turn somewhat different from 2 Peter ii. 10, to which Jude here alludes. Peter speaks of the lust, Jude of its gratification. In the sequel also Jude goes farther than Peter, a circumstance noteworthy with regard to their relation to each other. Ἀθετεῖν stronger than καταφρονεῖν; see on 2 Pet. ii. 10. 11. In like manner v. 9 contains an expansion of and deviation from 2 Pet. ii. 11. The attempt of interpreting that passage by the verse under notice leads to confusion and forced meanings.

VER. 9. **But Michael, the archangel**, etc.—A comparison showing the daring and criminality of their blaspheming. They dare to do something against the lordship and the glories (see on them note on 2 Peter ii. 11), which even Michael, the archangel, did not venture to do against Satan. The Hebrew Michael signifies, "Who is like God," and denotes the humility and greatness of this Prince of angels, as well as the standard of all his actions, cf. Ex. xv. 11; Ps. lxxxix. 7. 8. He is called one of the chief Princes, Dan. x. 13; the great Prince standing up and fighting for the children of the people of God, ch. xii. 1; cf. Rev. xii. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 16. In the book of Enoch, where however the incident mentioned is not recorded, we read of him (as cited by Huther): "Who (set) over human virtue, governs the nations." Jude supposes his readers familiar with this incident. The Jews had from ancient times various traditions of the burial of Moses, of a contest about his soul. According to Oecumenius, the tradition ran that God had charged Michael the archangel with the burial of Moses; that Satan opposed him, bringing an accusation against him relating to the murder of the Egyptian; in consequence of which he was unworthy of such honourable burial. Jude, like Paul, 2 Tim. iii. 8, probably drew from this tradition, the Spirit of God directing him to extract the truth from those traditions. It is therefore not necessary to assume here a special revelation vouchsafed to Jude. Origen, Epiphanius and others refer to a book called "*The Ascension or Removal of Moses*," but that book is doubtless of a later origin, and it is more probable that Jude made use of oral tradition rather than of that book.

Contending with the devil.—Διακρινόμενος διελέγετο; διακρίνεσθαι, to get into dispute, to separate and disagree, particularly to carry on a dispute in law. The words διελέγετο ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ show that it was a verbal altercation. Stier: "The powers of heaven and hell contended consequently for the body of the man of God after his death."

Dared not, etc.—Huther: "From fear of the original glory of the devil." Better, "from profound dread of the majesty of God." Κρίσιν ἐπιφέρειν, cf. Acts xxv. 18, to give a sentence of condemnation against one. Βλασφημίας=βλάσφημον, 2 Peter ii. 11, words of insult, anger, or words of satire and mockery. Stier remarks, that even Father Luther did occasionally transgress in this respect and speak far too defiantly against the enemy.

The Lord rebuke thee.—The Angel of the Covenant addresses these words to Satan in Zech. iii. 2; cf. Acts xxiii. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 14. The enemy himself has betrayed the secret that he may be overcome by the words, "The Most Merciful rebuke thee." Bengel: "Modesty is an angelic virtue."

VER. 10. **These, however**, etc.—Jude now passes from the particular expression of that daring disposition to the general. They speak evil, in general, of all things which they know not. For ὅσα is not=ἅ, but=*quæcunque*. The reference is to the whole sphere of things invisible and heavenly, including the δόξαι. They are held by the delusion of materialism, that only that is real which may be seen with the eyes and touched by the hands, cf. Col. ii. 18.

But those things which they understand.—Ἐπίστανται, apparently stronger than οἴδασι, is an ironical expression. The things they thoroughly understand, viz., the objects and means of sensual enjoyment, they use for

their destruction, and really understand nothing of their nature and effects.

Naturally, as the brute beasts; *φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα*, go together. Their understanding does not go beyond that which the instincts of nature, the instinctive desire of food and procreation, teach brute beasts. But they sink even beneath them because of their own free will and deliberation, they prostitute in carnal indulgence those powers of the soul which ought to introduce them to God and heavenly things. The parallel passage, 2 Peter ii. 12, reads: "They speak evil of the things that they understand not," with this difference, however, that Peter not only states the additional particular of the destiny of the brute creation, but connects also *φυσικὰ* with *ζῶα*, whereas here it goes with *ἐπίστασθαι*. It is evident that Jude made free use of the passage in Peter.

Therein do they ruin themselves, cf. 2 Peter ii. 12; Ps. xlix. 13. 21.

VER. 11. **Woe unto them**, etc.—An utterance of woe, of frequent occurrence in the speeches of our Lord, expressive of pain and indignation, and conveying the threat of punishment, cf. Matt. xi. 21; xviii. 7; xxiii. 13; xxiv. 19; xxvi. 24; Mark xiv. 21; xiii. 17; Luke vi. 24. 25; xi. 42; xvii. 1. Bengel: "The only passage where this Apostle alone utters a woe for three reasons." Paul says, 1 Cor. ix. 16: "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel." The expression occurs repeatedly in the book of Revelation, ch. viii. 13; ix. 12; xi. 14; xii. 12; xviii. 10. 16. 19. 2 Peter ii. 14, has "cursed children," lit. "children of malediction." Jude paraphrases it by, "woe unto them," which threatens them with the curse. Jude, in addition to the example of Balaam, which we have in 2 Peter, produces the examples of Cain and the company of Core as types of the mind and judgment of those persons. He adverts rather to the order of the matter than to the order of time.

They walked.—De Wette: "Their career is regarded as already completed, the author prophetically foreseeing their end." This contains a hint in favour of the genuineness of the Epistle.

The way of Cain; *τῇ ὁδῷ*, cf. Acts xiv. 16; ix. 31; the Dative of the direction in which [see above App. Crit., note 20.—M.], cf. 1 Sam. xv. 20; LXX., Tob. iv. 5. It is not difficult to find the point of comparison. It is acting upon mere natural instincts, on the selfish impulses of nature (cf. *φυσικῶς*, v. 10), in contempt of the warnings of God in the conscience and in His word. De Wette stops at the idea that Cain is here mentioned as the archetype of all bad men. Too general. Calov and others understand it of spiritual murder by deceiving the brethren, or of fiery persecution, so Lyra. Arbitrary. Schneckenburger refers to the moral skepticism of the deceivers, since in the later writings of the Jews, Cain is represented to have said: "There is no Judge, no other world, no reward for the righteous, no punishment for the wicked." Farfetched. Stier: "Selfish, hateful envy of the pious brother, because his piety was pleasing to God, consequently to God and man at one and the same time, the resistance of an evil conscience which is defiant instead of humbling itself, the root of the Cainite sin from which full hatred develops with fearful velocity into the act of murder." Huther: "In comparing these false teachers with Cain, Jude intends to describe them as resisting God from envy of the grace shown to believers." But this is not the description of those deceivers.—[Wordsworth: "Specially applicable to some classes of the Gnostics, who dared impiously to affirm that 'Cain was made by a power superior to that of the Creator; and who acknowledged Esau, Korah and the Sodomites, and all such, as their own kindred.' See Iren. 1, 31. (Stieren), 1, 35, p. 113 (Grabe). Cf. Tertull., *Præscr.* c. 47; Clem. Alexandr., *Strom.* 7, p. 549; Hippolyt., *Phil.* p. 183; Epiph., *Hær.* 38; Theodoret, *Hæret. fab.* c. 15; Philostr. c. 2; Tillemont, II., p. 21. These false teachers destroy like Cain; they love lucre and allure to sin like Balaam; they make divisions in the Church of Christ like Korah. Catena, p. 164, and cf. Bede on 1 John i. 6."—M.]

And in the error of Balaam, etc.—Peter has, "They went astray, following the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness." Jude gives this in a contracted form. See 2 Peter ii. 15. 16. *πλάνῃ*, cf. 2 Peter ii. 18; James v. 20; Ezek. xxxiii. 16, LXX. Huther: "Vicious life averted from the truth." Not=*εἰς πλάνην*, but the Dative of direction in which, like *τῇ ὁδῷ* and with *ἐξακολουθεῖν*, 2 Peter ii. 15; in the direction of erring.

Has drawn them along [they rushed headlong, see Appar. Crit., note 20.—M.]; *ἐκχεῖσθαι*, Middle, to stream forth like a torrent without a dam (Bengel), to suffer oneself to be carried away like the Latin *effundi in venerem, in libidines*. At the same time we may think of the meaning of שָׁפַךְ, to slip and fall, Ps. lxxiii. 2. [The force of the Greek verb is rather "to pour oneself out in a torrent." See Loesner, p. 583.—M.]. *Ἐξεχύθησαν μισθοῦ* The explanation, "They threw themselves into the error of Balaam for hire (= *ἀντὶ* or *ἕνεκα*)," is false; so is that of Schneckenburger: "They threw themselves into the error of Balaam in expectation of reward." De Wette's rendering also is very forced: "Through the seduction of Balaam's reward they poured themselves out in vice." In that case we ought to have *τοῦ μισθοῦ Βαλαάμ*.—*Μισθοῦ* should rather be taken in apposition with *Βαλαάμ*, a brief allusion, which is easily explained on the supposition that Jude had before him 2 Peter ii. 15. The point of comparison lies first in selfishness and avarice, then in seduction to unchastity.

In the gainsaying of Core they perished. —*ἀντιλέγειν*, to contradict, to quarrel, to offer resistance, used in LXX. for מְרִיבָה, cf. Jno. xix. 12; Heb. vi. 16; vii. 7; xii. 3. *Κορέ*, cf. Numb. xvi. 32; xxvi. 10. It was an insurrection against the Lord and His representatives under the cover of right and religion. Huther: "They lost themselves in the gainsaying of Core." He thinks that both the parallelism of the three clauses and the Preterite of the verb favour such a construction. The last reason proves nothing (see above), and the first is counterbalanced by the circumstance that *ἀπολέσθαι* is not used in the sense of losing oneself into a thing, of entangling oneself. Matt. x. 6 is not a

parallel passage. Grammatical usage permits no other explanation than this: "they perished in the gainsaying of Core, by offering like resistance to God and His holy ordinances." Stier sees a gradation in the words way, error and gainsaying. "The end and the beginning of the whole way is illustrated at the very commencement of history in the case of Cain, the rushing progress in the way of error is especially exhibited in the case of Balaam, the final insurrection and provocation of judgment is typified in Korah." Huther calls to mind that opposition to God sprung, in the case of Cain, from envy, in that of Balaam, from covetousness, in that of Korah from pride; v. 12 gives a further delineation of these deceivers, similar to 2 Pet. ii. 13. 17. [Irenæus, IV., 43, *ed. Grabe:* "The doom of those who rise against the true faith, and excite others against the Church of God, is to be swallowed up by the earth, and to remain in the gulf below, with Korah, Dathan and Abiram."—M.]

VER. 12. **These are spots in your love-feasts,** etc.—ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν, in your love-feasts, not, as Luther renders, in your alms, the exhibitions of love. The early degeneracy of the love-feasts connected with the Lord's Supper is evident from 1 Cor. xi. 20, etc. [Hippolytus, *Ref. Hæres.*, p. 172, states that the Simonians said that their promiscuous μίξεις were τελείαν ἀγάπην and μακαρίζοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ μίξει.—M.].—Σπιλάδες; σπιλάς or σπίλαξ really denotes a rock or a cliff, from σπέος, while σπίλος, the word used by Peter, means both a cliff and a spot. De Wette and Huther favour the literal sense: "It is these who are cliffs in your love-feasts, *i. e.*, on which these feasts split, or good morals suffer shipwreck (cf. 1 Tim. i. 19)." It is more simple to understand it of the seductive, dangerous power of these men. But we agree with Stier in preferring the sense of stain, spot, because, as he remarks, grammatical usage might easily change in words of such near affinity; these words having a common root might be used more or less loosely, and the parallel in 2 Peter favouring it. Possibly both (Peter and Jude) alluded to Deut. xxxii. 5. [Aretius: — "σπίλας *non solum est glarea, hoc est, terræ species* QUÆ MACULAS FACILE RELINQUIT, *sed est etiam concavum saxum in littore maris, seu lacuum ac fluminum,* IN QUAM CONCAVITATEM TANQUAM IN COMMUNE RECEPTACULUM SORDES AQUARUM CONFLUUNT." Mack. (Scott, Bloomf.): "The word σπιλάδες properly signifies *rocks in the sea*, which, *when they rise above its surface, appear like spots.*" Occumen., Theophyl. (ὕφαλοι πέτραι), Lightoot, Wetstein, Whitby, Meyer, de Wette, Schleusner, Huther, Peile, Lillie, Alford, Wordsworth, al., all agree in rendering "rocks." It is the only sense in which it occurs in ancient authors; it is, moreover, in better unison with the other metaphors by which Jude describes the false teachers (clouds, trees, waves, wandering stars) than spots. On these grounds we prefer "rocks" to "spots."—Wordsworth: — "These σπιλάδες may be well said to be ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις, where the Church looks only for peace and safety, as in a deep and placid harbor. The words *scopulus*, φάραγξ. *Charybdis, Euripus barathrum*, etc., are thus applied frequently *to persons*. See Florus, 4, 9, where Antony is called a *scopulus*; and Aristoph. *Equites*, 248, φάραγγα, καὶ Χάρυβδιν ἁρπαγῆς, and Anthol., 2, 15. 1, εἰς δολίους, where treacherous persons are compared to ὕφαλοι πέτραι. Horat., *Ep.* I., 15. 31,—

Pernicies et tempestas barathrumque macelli,
Quicquid quæsierat ventri donabat avaro.—M.]

συνευωχούμενοι. De Wette objects to supplying ὑμῖν, and translates "carousing together without fear;" so Stier. But since 2 Pet. ii. 13 has ὑμῖν, and ἀφόβως thus gets a better sense, moreover since otherwise σύν would be superfluous, it is perhaps better to render: "They carouse with you, push themselves to your love-feasts." It is singular, however, that they not only would do so with impunity, but that Jude does not insist upon separation. The same objection, however, arises at 2 Peter ii. 13, and is not so very difficult to be met. [It is to be regretted that Fronmüller has withheld the solution of the difficulty. The only one we are able to supply is that these false teachers abused the well-known liberal hospitality of the early Christians by clandestinely appearing at their love-feasts. The insertion of ὑμῖν is against the weight of MSS. evidence, and discountenanced by the majority of versions and reliable exegetes.—M.]

Without fear.—The most natural construction is to take ἀφόβως with συνευωχούμενοι, not with ποιμαίνοντες (Stier), which would isolate the former too much. They are so insolent as to dread neither correction nor expulsion, and still less the monitions of their own conscience. Bengel misses the sense by rendering, "To feast together is not wrong *per se*, therefore, ἀφόβως ought to be connected with this verb (ποιμαίν.)."

Feeding themselves.—Jude refers to Ezek. xxxiv. 2. 8, "Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves," cf. Is. lvi. 11. We learn from this circumstance that those deceivers set up as guides and leaders of the flock, and that they sought the wool of the sheep, not the sheep themselves, cf. 1 Pet. v. 2. [Alford:—"Using the ἀγάπαι not for their legitimate purpose, the realization of the unity of Christians by social union, but for *their own* purposes, the enjoyment of their lusts and the furtherance of their schemes."—M.]. The remark of Huther, that there is no other hint of said adversaries having filled the ecclesiastical office, is perfectly true, but that does not exclude their setting up as teachers and leaders. The true point of view is displaced if ποιμαίνοντες is restricted to the agapæ and expounded (as de Wette does), "They take their fill while they suffer the poor (the majority, the flock) to want." 1 Cor. xi. 21. ποιμαίνειν, in that sense, would be an inappropriate term. The sequel also does not relate to the agapæ.

Clouds without water, driven fast by winds.—[Alford: — "Driven out of course by winds;" he reads παραφερόμενοι (with A. B. C. K., al.), borne out of their course, hither and thither.—M.]. In 2 Pet. ii. 17 another figure, viz.: "wells without water," precedes the parallel to this, while here one is added which is wanting there, viz.: "dead trees." De Wette, who applies the figure to the agapæ, is certainly wrong in saying that these men added largely to the

agapæ, without sharing their contributions with the poor. No, the reference is rather to the promise and boasting of great and profound knowledge, but it is idle show and vapour, cf. Prov. xxv. 14. They are carried about by every wind of doctrine, and cannot satisfy the wants of those who thirst for the truth. Huther:—"The figure delineates the inward spiritual emptiness of those men, who on that account are unable to do good, but it seems also to intimate their deceptive ostentation, which has been pointed out by Calvin." The reference to doing good, however, belongs not to this, but to the next figure. ποιμαίνοντες and νεφέλαι point unmistakably to their arrogated teaching and leading.—Περιφερόμεναι, driven about, fitfully driven to and fro. [See above Appar. Crit., note 22.—M.] Peter has ἐλαυνόμεναι.

Late autumnal trees, etc. — Φθινοπωρινά, from φθίνω and ὀπώρα; ὀπώρα signifies the hottest season of the year; when that is over (φθίνει), the φθινόπωρον, late autumn, the beginning of winter, sets in; the adjective denotes, therefore, "late-autumnal," not "fruit spoiling," as Stier renders, contrary to grammatical usage. [The best account of this word is that given by Lillie *in loco*, which is here transcribed: "According to Passow (as translated by Liddell and Scott), ὀπώρα is, 1, 'the part of the year between the *rising of Sirius and of Arcturus* . . . . not so much . . . . *autumn* as our *dog days*, or at most *the end of summer*;' and then, because this was the *season of fruit*, it stands, 2, for '*the fruit itself*, esp. *tree-fruit*;—and hence also the verb ὀπωρίζω is *to gather fruits*. φθίνω, again is used, 1, intransitively, *to decay*, *wither*, and, 2, transitively, to *corrupt*, *destroy*. Joining the two words, each in its first signification, we have φθινόπωρον, *autumn*, or more commonly, *senescens auctumnus et in hyemem vergens* (Steph. Scap.), *late autumn*, *the fall of the year* (L. and S.); and φθινοπωρινός, *belonging to that season*—which are the only meanings of those compounds which the lexicons recognize as classical. In that sense, accordingly, is the Adjective taken here, in connection with ἄκαρπα, by Wicl. (*harvest-trees without fruit*), Tynd., Cranm., (*without fr. at gathering time*), Castal., (*autumnales infructuosæ*), Thom., (*auctumnal trees without fruit*), Dav., (*aut. trees stripped of their fruit*); and apart from that connection, by Rhemish; Vulg., and its followers generally, Dutch, French, Swiss, *margin*; Engl., Ann., Hamm.; Cocc.; Beausobre and L'Enfant, *margin*; Bengel, Moldenh; Hænlein (erroneously cited by Huther), Meyer, Gerlach, Barn.; de W.; Peile, (*trees on the wane*—"fallen into the sere and yellow leaf"), Huther;—Wahl, Robinson, Green, (*autumnal, sere, bare*), Schirl. The same interpretation is allowed also by Zeg., Wits., Gill, Laurm., Rosenm., Trol., ('*without leaves*,' [which is also Wesley's version], '*as trees are in autumn*'), Bloomf.;—Schleusn. The second significations of φθίνω and ὀπώρα, however, appear combined in the use, according to Phavor., of φθινόπωρον to denote νόσος φθίνουσα ὀπώρας (hence Clarke: *galled* or *diseased trees;* an etymology and sense allowed also by Wits., Laurm., Trol., *cankered;*—Schleus.), and in Pindar's use of φθινοπωρίς. Liddell and Scott do, indeed, mark this last word as a 'pecul. fem.' of φθινοπωρινός, which they explain to mean *autumnal*. But in the passage referred to—Pyth., 5, 161, 162, φθινοπωρὶς ἀνέμων χειμερία καταπνοά—φθινοπωρίς evidently does not mean that, but rather the *blighting* influence of these *wintry* blasts, and so it is explained by the best commentators of Pindar. Heyne translates thus: 'FRUCTIBUS EXITIALIS *ventorum* HIBERNUS *flatus*;' and the most recent editor, Prof. Schneidewin, has the following note: 'ὀπώρα, ὥρα *auctumus, annus dicuntur pro iis quæ giguntur iis temporibus. Jam sensus: Valeas viribus et consilio etiam in posterum, ne ventus* BRUMALIS *tibi* PERDAT *temporis* FRUCTUS.' If it be said that the common version requires the noun to be taken in its second signification and the verb in its first, it may be replied, 1, that this acknowledged secondary meaning of the noun is its meaning in the only place where it is found in the New Testament, viz.: Rev. xviii.; 14;—2, that the intransitive use of the verb is by far the more frequent;—and, 3, that the verb retains this intransitive sense in other analogous cases of composition; *e. g.*, φθινόκαρπος, applied by Pindar, *Pyth.*, 4, 471, to an oak from which the limbs had been lopped; and φθινόκωλος, *with wasting limbs* (L. and S.). While, therefore, our present form φθινοπωρινός may not, in the one or two instances where it is found elsewhere, bear the meaning here ascribed to it, I concur nevertheless in the remark of Grotius: '*Si usum vocis respicias, dicit arbores auctumnales. Sed magis respicitur* ἐτυμολογία *vocis, ut dicat eos similes esse arboribus, quarum fructus perit illico.*' This sense, moreover, is more in harmony with the design of the writer, which is to describe the *characteristic* and *inward* spiritual desolation of these wicked men . . . . , and it lays a firmer basis for the dreadful climax whereby he effects that object, cf. Matt. xiii. 22; Lke. viii. 14, etc."—M.] They stand there, like late-autumnal trees, which have no fruit but only dry leaves. They deceive our expectations, as the baren fig-tree, Matt. xxi. 19; Lke. xiii. 6, and are therefore ripe for the curse and woodman's axe. As we expect the clouds to yield water, so we expect the trees to yield fruit. The former relates to their teaching, the latter to their life. Bengel:—"Trees, as they appear at the end of autumn, without fruit and leaves," cf. Is. i. 30. Jude thinks of persons, who year after year are like late-autumnal trees. This is not a weak, but a very striking description, whereas, if we follow the etymology, the addition of ἄκαρπος would be superfluous.

Unfruitful.—Not "whose fruit has been taken off," as de Wette, but without fruit [or better, incapable of yielding fruit.—M.]

Twice dead, not=wholly dead, which is arbitrary, for the figure is taken from trees which have at different times suffered fatal injury by frost or from insects. Stier: "By nature we are through the fall altogether dead trees; now these persons, having received the grace of regeneration, have died a second time (2 Peter ii. 20). This is the second death in guilt and punishment." Others (like Grotius) erroneously interpret these words of the first (earthly) and the second (post-terrene) death, seeing death had not yet affected them in either respect. [Wordsworth: "So these men are trees, which *died twice*,

because these men having been once dead in trespasses and sins, and raised to life in baptism, have relapsed and apostatized into the death of sin, and so have *died twice;* and because by their sins they have incurred the *second death.* See Rev. ii. 11; xx. 6. 14; xxi. 8, where it is said that the *second death* is the penalty of the *unbelieving, abominable,* and *fornicators.*" Oecumenius: "*τὰ φθινοπώρινα δένδρα δὶς ἀποθνήσκοντα, ἐν τε τῇ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτῶν ἀποβολῇ, καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν φύλλων ἀποῤῥοῇ.*" De Wette illustrates by "*bis dat qui cito dat,*" and Horace's "*pro quo bis patior mori.*" Alford refers to the double death in a tree, which is not only as it seems to the eye in common with other trees, in the apparent death of winter, but really dead: dead to appearance and dead in reality.—M.]

Uprooted, not trees dug out and thus eradicated, but such as still remain in the earth, shaken loose by their roots, and thus incapable of shedding leaves and bearing fruit. Figurative description of men torn loose from this vital foundation and the communion of the Church, no longer moved by the Holy Spirit, having ceased to do good works, and doomed to the penalty of the obdurate, cf. John xv. 6; Matt. iii. 10. [Arnaud: "*Tous ces mots sont des métaphores energiques pour montrer le néant de ces impures, la légèreté de leur conduite, la sterilité de leur foi et l'absence de leurs bonnes mœurs.*"—M.]

VER. 13. **Raging waves of the sea** [German, "WILD waves," better than raging, so Alford.—M.]. The Apostle probably thought of Isa. lvii. 20: "But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt," cf. Wisd. xiv. 1. *ἄγριος* is elsewhere used of wild beasts. The figure describes their passionate conduct, their rushing against divinely-ordered barriers, their inward impurity and hurtfulness, cf. Ps. xlvi. 4. The figurative expression of Isaiah has a literal application in the Epistle.

'Ε*παφρίζειν*, properly to foam over, cover with foam, foam out. *αἰσχύνας*, an emphatic Plural, as 1 Peter iv. 3, all kinds of shame proceeding from the evil treasure of the heart. Huther: "Shameful lusts, which they exhibit in their wild, immoral life."

Wandering stars, etc.—*ἀστέρες πλανῆται*, wandering stars, from *πλανᾷν, πλανᾶσθαι*, cf. v. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 13. [Alford: "Comets, which astonish the world for awhile and then pass away into darkness.—Those professing Christians, by their profession of being lights in the world, instead of letting that light shine on more and more into the perfect day, are drifting about in strange errors of doctrine and practice, until it will be utterly extinguished in eternal darkness."—M.]. It is difficult to see why the reference to comets, which were known to the people in ancient times, should be pronounced arbitrary (Huther). "That have no regular course, and depart from the sun (of righteousness)." Meyer. So also de Wette and Stier; the latter says: "If a star loses or deviates from its place or course, it either falls forthwith down dark, or, and that is the sense here, it roves awhile with deceitful light until it reaches the point and catastrophe, which God has appointed." The word *ἀστέρες* again contains a reference to men, that set up for lights of the Church, cf. Rev. i. 20; Dan. xii. 3; Phil. ii. 15. So Oecumenius. We must not think of authorized teachers, but remember that men, in order to gain distinction in those Churches, had to render themselves prominent by the light of knowledge; de Wette interprets the metaphor of the outward splendour of the luxury and perhaps also of the authority of those men; Huther applies the metaphor to unstable men, driven hither and thither by their carnal appetites, whose life presents the strongest contrast to the calm, well-ordered life of Christians. But this does not explain the term *ἀστέρες*.—Bengel observes: "It has recently been discovered that planets are opaque bodies that shine with borrowed light. Jude was enabled to intimate this in virtue of Divine illumination." But the reference is neither to planets nor their opacity.

To whom [better, *for* whom.—M.] **the blackness of darkness is reserved forever.**—Cf. the parallel passage, 2 Peter ii. 17, and the commentary on it. Stier: "The comets, as unstable, disrupted ruins, may be hastening forward to a final darkness among the slags of the last process of reconstruction."

VER. 14. **But of** [*for*.—M.] **these also prophesied Enoch, the seventh from Adam.**—Now follows a prophecy of Enoch of these people. *τούτοις*, with reference to them; see Winer, p. 244, cf. Luke xviii. 31.—*καὶ* should be connected with *προφήτευσε*, not with *τούτοις*. As other prophets, so Enoch also, the most ancient of prophets.

The seventh from Adam, cf. Gen. v. 18. There are really only five patriarchs between Enoch and Adam, viz., Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel and Jared, but Adam is included as the first. This designation, although omitted by commentators, occurs repeatedly in the book of Enoch; *e. g.*, we read, ch. xciii. 8: "I, as the seventh, am born in the first week, while judgment and justice were delayed;" cf. ch. lx. 8: "In the seventh week there shall arise an apostate generation;" ch. xxxvii. 1, traces back the genealogy of Enoch to Adam, not for the sake of embellishment, but in order to remove all doubt as to his personal identity." The epithet "the seventh" cannot be without meaning; Calvin thinks that it is intended to denote the great age of this prophecy; others see in it a secret, mystical meaning. Bengel: "Every seventh is the most esteemed." Stier: "The seventh from Adam is personally a type of the sanctified of the seventh age of the world (of the seventh millennium, of the great earth-sabbath), therefore he prophesies for this time." Menken: "The number seven was esteemed in the ancient world as an important signature pointing to the sacred and mystery. The fact that after sin and death had freely exerted their unhappy power during the first six generations, in the seventh generation mankind appeared in the person of one man (who had led a godly life, and was taken by God to God without seeing death) in a state of high completeness and blessed freedom from death, has a kind of prophetico-symbolical significance, and intimates that mankind in general, after having duly completed its course and fought its battle under the oppression of sin and death through six long world-periods, shall appear in the seventh world-period in a state of higher

completeness, in a more Divine life and more blessed freedom from death. The seventh world-period is the Kingdom of God on earth. To Adam, the first, was revealed and promised the appearance and advent of the Lord, as a Helper and Saviour; to Enoch, the seventh from Adam, was revealed the last advent of the same Lord, Helper and Saviour, as a Judge and Avenger, and he was the first prophet, who spoke and taught this among men." ["The number *seven* is sacred above all; Enoch is *seventh* from Adam and walks with God; Moses is *seventh* from Abraham; Phineas is *seventh* from Jacob our father, as Enoch was *seventh* from Adam. And they correspond to the *seventh* day, which is the Sabbath, the day of rest. Every seventh age is in the highest esteem." Wetstein, citing Rabbinical writings, p. 737. Wordsworth deems it worthy of remark, that Enoch lived as many years as there are days in a solar year, viz., 365, and was then translated (Gen. v. 24.)—M.]. The words which follow are found almost literally in the above-mentioned apocryphal book of Enoch, which was formerly known only by fragments and notices of the early fathers, but has recently been discovered in an Æthiopic translation and translated from the Æthiopic into German. It became known in Europe about the close of the last century. Winer, Dorner and others ascribe its authorship to a Jew of the first century of the Christian era; Ewald places its date at the end of the second century before Christ. A new edition and translation of this book was published by D. Dillmann in 1853, who pronounces it to have been written about B.C. 110. The book consists, according to the careful investigation of the last-named scholar, of three parts: 1. The proper and original book of Enoch, which constitutes the greatest part of this apocryphal work. 2. Of historical additions for the elucidation of several doctrines and ideas from the pen of another author, who wrote not long afterwards. 3. Of so-called Noachian additions connected with other interpolations made by a third author, belonging at least to the end of the first century B.C. The passage in question is rendered by Dillmann thus: "And behold, He comes with myriads of saints to execute judgment on them, and He will destroy the ungodly and judge all flesh in all things which the sinners and the ungodly have committed and done against Him," ch. i. 9. Considering that the variations between the Epistle and the book of Enoch are not inconsiderable, and that the book of Enoch is not expressly cited, there is still room to doubt whether Jude knew that book. But the tradition of Enoch's prophecy he must at all events have known and considered true as to its kernel. [There is an English translation by Archbishop Lawrence, with an introduction and notes, which passed through three editions, 1821, 1833, 1838, but has been completely superseded by that of Dillmann, with an introduction and commentary, published at Leipzig in 1853. See Introduction § 7.—M.]

Behold the Lord came with His holy myriads.—Now follows the substance of the prophecy.—Ἦλθε, the Aorist, because Enoch speaks in a vision, in which the future appears to him as present [really a prophetic past.—M.], as in Isa. ix. 6; liii 4. The Æthiopic text of the book of Enoch seems to have the Present.

With His holy myriads; ἐν. *In* them, *i. e.*, to be glorified in them, as 2 Thess. i. 10, and with them. Myriads, literally ten thousands, then absolutely, many thousands. The book of Enoch in other similar passages with reference to Dan. vii., uses the terms thousand times thousand, and ten thousand times ten thousand; so ch. xl. 1; lxxi. 10. In Deut. xxxiii. 2, Jehovah is represented as revealing Himself from Sinai, shining forth from among many thousands of saints. According to Zech. xiv. 5, He will come to judgment with all His saints, cf. Matt. xxv. 31; Rev. v. 11. The term denotes not only angels, but also the elect from among men; cf. Heb. xii. 22; 1 Cor. vi. 2.—*With His*, αὐτοῦ. They belong to Him, stand before His throne, and wait for His commands.

Ver. 15. **To give judgment**, etc.—κρίσιν ποιεῖν. John v. 27; cf. Gen. xviii. 25; to execute it in fact. [The term here and in the references seems rather to denote the functions of the Judge, than those of the executor.—M.]

To convict all the ungodly; ἐξελέγξαι, the composite form intensifies the idea, which is their thorough and absolute conviction, not their punishment; the reference is to inward conviction in the conscience. [I doubt whether this interpretation is exhaustive; the conviction of course begins with the conscience, but the intensive nature of the composite seems to imply a conviction that shall bring the convicted to judgment, and entail the execution of the judicial sentence.—M.]

Wherein they were ungodly; ἀσεβεῖν used transitively, cf. 2 Peter ii. 6. Winer, p. 236. The guilt of ungodliness is here made very prominent, the same word being used four times, cf. Zeph. iii. 11.

Of all the hard speeches; σκληρός, hard, dry, rough, indigestible [?—M.], used figuratively of daring, impious blasphemy; cf. 1 Sam. ii. 3; Mal. iii. 13; Numb. xvi. 26. Differently, John vi. 60. This involves even greater guilt than the works which were the result of their ungodly disposition; hence they are named first. In the above-cited passage from the book of Enoch, nothing is said of such hard speeches; but soon after we read: "Ye have reviled His greatness with arrogant, blasphemous speeches of your unclean mouth; ye hard-hearted, ye shall find no peace," ch. v. 4; cf. ch. xlvi. 7.

Against Him.—"Although they did not believe that all their ungodly speeches were aimed at Him."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Those who know the book of Enoch, with its absurd fancies and its coarse notions of the heavenly world, must revere more strongly than ever the chasteness and truth of our canonical writings, and be grateful to the Church for rejecting such clumsy fabrications. In that book we read, *e. g.*, of the giants or tyrants mentioned in Gen. vi., that "the women with whom the angels had intercourse, conceived and brought forth great giants 6000 feet [German: 3000 *Ellen*.—M.] in height. These ate up all the produce of

men, until men were unable to sustain them any longer. Then the giants turned upon the men to devour them," etc. The book is full of the coarsest materialism, stating as irrefragable facts that there are in heaven particular receptacles for the winds, for hail, snow and rain, for thunder and lightning, that there is a literal cornerstone of the earth, and that the sky is supported by columns. Here is something to learn for the modern friends of an extreme realism.

2. The guilt of the heavenly spirits that apostatized from God is the more aggravated, because in their case there was no temptation from without, as in that of men.

3. Those deceivers confirm the old, but in most instances not sufficiently acknowledged truth, that the decisions of the will are not so much the result of thinking and perceiving, as, on the contrary, thinking and perceiving the result of the decisions of the will. Demosthenes (*Olynth.*, II., 32) already declared "that persons accustomed to do mean and bad acts cannot understand a great and powerful thought, and that the thoughts and intentions of men are the reflections of their manner of life."

4. In reading the account of corruption given in this Epistle, we have to apply the rule belonging to the prophecies of the Old Testament, that the events described in them take place at different times and stages of development before they meet their final and highest fulfilment.

5. "The whole development of evil, as well as of good, grows like a tree, the very beginnings of which contain the same kind in the germ, and foretell the end; but the Spirit of God has, with prophetic vision, described to us the events and delineated the persons for the future." Stier.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Our curiosity should not lead us to seek to penetrate the mysterious incidents of the apostasy of angels; we should rather take warning from so much of it as is clear.—The necessity of continuing in grace, lest somebody spoil us of our crown.—Whoso rejects the light here and does not walk in the light now, will hereafter dwell in eternal darkness.—Whatever is spoken or written against the servants of God, the Eternal Judge will consider as spoken or written against Himself.

H. Rieger:—It is an old experience of constant and multiform repetition, that the most licentious men are generally also the most impatient of all checks emanating from human sources, that they decry all government and authority as an invention of the devil, and abuse the liberty of the Gospel as a cloak of maliciousness. [Sensuality and lawlessness go together. — M.] — Those who walk in the way of Cain hypocritically observe the externals of religion and its exercise, but are at mortal enmity with whatever aims at the spirit and the truth, and thus end with being driven away from the face of God.

Starke:—It often happens that the more good God does to man, the more man wanders away from God, Deut. xxxii. 15. But if men resist the goodness of God, He has recourse to severity and justice, Rom. ii. 4; xi. 22. — Unbelief is certainly the greatest sin, and the source of all other vices.—Heaven is a many-mansioned house, Jno. xiv. 2. Thank God that through Christ we may once more return to our first home, whereas the devils have left their habitation forever, 2 Cor. v. 1. 2.—The life of heaven is a state of liberty, light and peace; the life of hell is a state of confinement, darkness and perpetual fear of more punishment.—Sins that cannot be named in decency, or on account of ignorance, are yet so common among Christians that a preacher does not know whether he ought to speak of them, or be silent, Ez. viii. 8. 9.—O! the mad blindness of men, that will not grow wise by other people's injury, but will persist in their daring even to the extent of being made examples of the Divine judgment, 2 Chron. xxx. 8; Lke. xiii. 4. 5.—Although some governments are not what they ought to be, men ought to honour in them the image of God, Ex. xxii. 28.—True zeal, be it never so great, is always humble and modest, whereas false zeal is defiant and passionate, Rom. x. 2.—Jesus uttered His woes on none more than on false teachers and hypocrites, Matt. xxiii. 13. They have the heart of a Cain, a Balaam and a Korah.—Gold and honours are two hooks with which the devil fishes and catches many thousand souls for his kingdom, Jno. xiii. 2; 1 Chron. xxii. 1.—All the feasts of Christians ought by rights to be love-feasts, Neh. viii. 10.—Can there be anything more unhappy than being rooted out and separated from the communion of the life of Christ? Col. ii. 7.—Think ye that the pagans were allowed to revile their gods, as God is, without let or punishment, blasphemed among Christians? But have patience, Jesus will summon those mighty blasphemers to His bar, and avenge the insult that has been heaped upon Him.

[*Literature on v.* 9:—

Hecht, Joannes, *Disputatio inauguralis de certamine Michaëlis cum Diabolo de corpore Mosis*, 4to., Jenæ., 1853.

Nieremberg, N., *Exercitatio exegetico-polemica de Angelica super corpore Mosis discrepatione*, 4to., Ratisbonæ, 1682.

Bachmann, I. G., *De certamine circa corpus Mosis*, Crit. Sac., Thes., 2, 794.

Hensel, M. Z., *De certamine Archangeli Michaëlis cum Diabolo de corpore Mosis*, Crit. Sac., Thes., 2, 797.

Calmet, A., *La Mort et la Sépulture de Moyse*, Dissertations, Commentaire, 8, 753.—M.]

VERSES 16–23.

CONTENTS:—Further description of the persons who were the subjects of the Apostles' prophecies, v. 16–19; followed by an exhortation to edification on the foundation of faith, and to proper treatment of the deceived with a view to their salvation, vv. 20–23.

16 [1]These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth
speaketh great swelling *words*, having men's persons in admiration[2] because of advant-
17 age.[3] But,[4] beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken[5] before of the apostles
18 of[6] our Lord Jesus Christ; How[7] that they told you there should[8] be mockers in the
19 last time,[9] who should walk after their own ungodly lusts.[10] These be they who sep-
20 arated themselves, sensual,[11] having not the Spirit.[12] But ye, beloved, building up
21 yourselves on your[13] most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, Keep yourselves in
the love of God, looking[14] for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.
22 23 And of[15] some have compassion, making a difference:[16] And others save with[17]
fear, pulling[18] *them* out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.[19]

Verse 16. [1 German:—"These are they, murmurers, discontented *with God and the world*." The italicized words are paraphrase and comment, rather than translation. γογγυσταί, *murmurers*, describes their views of God, μεμψίμοιροι, complainers, denotes their discontent with their lot.—M.]
[2 German:—"Flatterers to the *face*" is too free, better, "admiring persons," which adheres more closely to the Greek θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα.—M.]
[3 German:—"For profit's sake."—M.]
Verse 17. [4 ὑμεῖς δὲ, but ye. So German, all the old English and foreign versions, except the Dutch.—M.]
[5 6 German:—"the words which were foretold you by the Apostles;" too free, better retain the rendering of E. V.: "which were spoken before," but substituting "*by*," ὑπὸ, for "*of*."—M.]
[7 The German omits "*how*," which is superfluous; render, "that they told you, etc."—M.]
[8 ἔσονται, shall be; so German, Vulgate, Reims, al.—M.]
9 Lachm. and Tischend. read ἐπ' ἐσχατόυ τοῦ χρ. ἐλεύσονται. Stier considers this reading an imitation of 2 Pet. iii. 3. [It is the reading of A. B. C. and Sin.; but B. C. omit τοῦ before χρόνου, so Meyer and Huther. ἐλεύσονται is marked * * in Cod. Sin. by Tischendorf.—M.]
[10 German:—"who walk after their own lusts in ungodlinesses." While it is better to retain the participial construction, with Vulg., Syr., it is also better to bring out the grammatical relation of ἐπιθυμίας and ἀσεβειῶν, and to translate the whole verse: "that they told you that in the last time there shall be scoffers, walking according to their own lusts in ungodliness."—M.]
Verse 19. [11 *a*. ἑαυτούς, B. C., Vulg., Griesb., al.; A., Sin., Tischend., Lachm., al. omit it. Lillie suggests "*separate*" without the Pronoun; the sense is hardly affected by the omission, for ἀποδιορίζοντες may be taken with the reflexive force which transitive verbs sometimes do bear (Winer, p. 266), and signifies "separatists," both in doctrine and Church-fellowship.—M.]
[*b*. ψυχικοί, German:—"*Seelische;*" the English "*animal*" on account of its connection with the Latin *anima*, the French *âme*, respectively answering to the Greek ψυχή. has something to recommend it, but is not as expressive and correct as "*psychical*" or "*soulish*."—M.]
[12 πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. German: "That have no spirit," or retaining the Participial construction: "having no spirit."—M.]
Verse 20. 13 C. reads ἡμῶν for ὑμῶν. [Sin. observes the following order: ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει.—M.]
[German: ". . . . build yourselves further up on your most holy faith in the Holy Ghost with prayer." better render with closer adherence to the Greek: "building up yourselves on your most holy faith praying in the Holy Ghost."—M.]
Verse 21. [14 προσδεχόμενοι, "waiting for" (German) better than "looking for".—M.]
Verse 22. [15 "οὓς μὲν et οὓς δε *rite sibi invicem opponuntur*." Laurmann. The opposition should be marked, and I adopt accordingly Lillie's rendering: "On some, *indeed*, have compassion"—M.]
16 C. reads; οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους; οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ. A. B., followed by Lachmann and Tischendorf, have three members. 1. ἐλέγχετε (B. ἐλεᾶτε); 2. σώζετε . . . . . ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες; 3. ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ μισοῦντες. De Wette ascribes the last ἐλεᾶτε to a gloss, or the mistake of a transcriber. Vulgate: "*hos quidem arguite judicatos*."
[Sin., ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους. On the different interpretations of this difficult verse see below in EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL, where the whole subject is discussed.—M.]
Verse 23. [17 ἐν φόβῳ, "*in* fear", not "with fear" as E. V.—Sin. reads: " . . . σώζετε ἐκ—πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ." See more below in EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.—M.]
[18 "*Snatch*" or "*pluck*" better than "pull."—M.]
[19 The whole verse according to the Sinaitic reading would run thus: "But others save, plucking them out of the fire; and on others have compassion in fear." So substantially Lachmann, Tischendorf, Wordsworth, Alford.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 16. **These are**, etc.—Jude, as with uplifted finger, points once more to these ungodly men, of whom Enoch prophesied.

Murmurers.—ἅπαξ λεγόμενον from γογγύζω, to murmur or mutter, as well as μεμψίμοιροι, to which the former is nearly related. The object of their murmuring is not mentioned. Ver. 15 seems to intimate that it was their discontent with the appointments and dispensations of Divine Providence, opposition to their superiors, especially in the Church, like the company of Korah murmured against Moses and Aaron, and like Diotrephes. 3 Jno. 9.

Complainers.—[German: *Discontented with God and the world.* Alford following the German versions: "*Dissatisfied with their lot.*" —M.]. μεμψίμοιροι, properly, fault-finders with Providence, and the lot apportioned to them. From a passage in Theophrast, cited by de Wette, it

would seem to be used of censoriousness and discontent in general. Bengel explains it of discontent with God. This word denotes the outward, the former the inward. [Cf. Theophrast, char. XVII. *περὶ μεμψιμοιρίας* and *contrast* this character with St. Paul's spirit and language in Phil. iv. 11. 12; 1 Tim. vi. 6–8; Heb. xiii. 5. Wordsw., Philo, *Vit. Mos.*, p. 109, 29, says of the Jews, *καὶ πάλιν ἤρξαντο μεμψιμοιρεῖν*; Lucian, *Sacrif.*, I., *τῆς 'Αρτέμιδος μεμψιμοιρούσης, ὅτι μὴ παρειλήφθη πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Οἰνέως*. Hesychius explains *μεμψιμοιρός* thus: *μεμφόμενος τὸ ἀγαθόν· ἢ φιλεγκλήμων, ἢ φιλαίτιος*.—M.]

Walking after their own lusts.—The same expression occurs 2 Pet. iii. 3; cf. ch. ii. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 3. Calvin gives the right connection with the preceding thus: "Those who yield themselves to their evil lusts, are also murmuring and discontented, so that one can never do things right for them."

And their mouth speaketh great swelling things.—Boastful, impudent words. Cf. notes on 2 Pet. ii. 18. The book of Enoch contains frequent references to such vaunting speeches directed against God and His appointments; it has the peculiar expression: "and these are they that control the stars and lift up their hands against the Most High." Jas. iii. 5; Dan. vii. 8. 20.

Admiring persons.—(German: "*Flatterers to the face*"); literally, "admiring the faces." The former is to be taken as a parenthesis. Cf. Gen. xix. 21; Lev. xix. 15; Deut. x. 17, rendered by LXX. *θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον* = נָשָׂא פָּנִים, to favour one, to prefer, honour and highly esteem. So Stier, de Wette, Huther. The first and third parallel passages, however, are inapplicable, the reference in them being to God's dealings with man, and the second relates to partiality, as in Sir. vii. 29. But as it is not said here whose person they regard, while in other places we have always some qualification, such as the person of the great or poor, it seems more fitting to emphasize *πρόσωπα* and to explain it with reference to sensuality, the leading characteristics of those deceivers, thus: they flatter the objects of their lust, extol their beauty and thus lure them to themselves in order to use them for their own purposes, not excluding pecuniary advantage. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 14, where sensuality and covetousness are intimately connected.—*ὠφελείας χάριν* should be closely connected with *θαυμάζοντες*. ["Calvin: "*Magniloquentiam taxat, quod se ipsos fastuose jactent: sed interea ostendit illiberali esse ingenio, quia serviliter se dimittant.*"—Fronmüller's interpretation of *θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα* is very far-fetched. The phrase is a Hebraism and signifies to *respect the person* in a good or bad sense, to be partial, as a judge unjustly partial or corrupted by bribes; cf. Hebrew and LXX. of Lev. xix. 15; Job xxxii. 21; xxxiv. 19; Ps. lxxxii. 2; Prov. xviii. 5; Deut. x. 17; 2 Chron. xix. 7; Job xiii. 10; Mal. ii. 9; where it is used in a bad sense. There is no need for the reference to sensuality, for the meaning that they favoured the rich and influential by accommodating their teaching to their prejudices and vicious practices is in perfect keeping with the character of those false teachers in particular, and all time-servers in general.—M.]

VER. 17. **But ye, beloved, remember the words which were spoken before by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.**—As Peter thought it necessary to remind his readers of the Apostolical word in order to protect them from deceivers, 2 Pet. iii. 2. 15. 16, so Jude feels prompted to adopt the same course. Besides the second Epistle of Peter, Jude may here refer to passages like Acts xx. 29, 30; 2 Tim. iii. 1, etc. The primary reference is to their warnings against deceivers, the secondary to their exhortations to stedfastness and perseverance in the faith.

By the Apostles.—The unprejudiced reader of these words can hardly resist the conviction that this Epistle is not that of an Apostle, even as the author does not call himself an Apostle in v. 1. Sepp's opinion that he distinguishes himself from the other Apostles by the designation "the Lord's brother" is sophistical. [I fully concur with Alford that this text is not decisive as to whether St. Jude was, or was not, an Apostle. He *might* use the expression, being himself an Apostle, and he is certainly more likely to have used it, not being an Apostle. St. Peter, on the authority A. B. C. K. L., al., at 2 Pet. iii. 3 uses the same expression without the *ἡμῶν*—"and whichever view is taken as to the genuineness or otherwise of 2 Peter, there could be no intention by such an expression to exclude either the real or the pretended St. Peter from the number of the Apostles."—M.].—The contrast of Peter's language (2 Pet. iii. 2) is remarkable. Jude's using in the next verse *ὑμῖν* and not *ἡμῖν* does not prove anything. [For while it is not certain that he included himself among the Apostles, it is very uncertain whether he intended to exclude himself from their number. So Alford.—M.]. The principal reason why the reference is not to the Lord's self-own words is stated by Stier, who says that we have the account of the words and works of Jesus from the lips of the Apostles, or on the testimony confirmed by the Apostles.

Spoken before.—The term includes both the *priority* of their testimony and its *prophetical* character. [This is the reason why the rendering of E. V. is preferable to the German translation. See above in Appar. Crit. v. 17. 4.—Wordsworth: "There seems also to be reference here to the description of the last days in St. Paul's last Epistle, 2 Tim. iii. 1–6, *ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἔσονται ἄνθρωποι φίλαυτοι κ. τ. λ.* There is a special propriety in this admonitory reference in this Epistle—one of the last of the Catholic Epistles—to the last warning in the Epistles, of the Apostles of the Circumcision and of the Gentiles, St. Peter and St. Paul. Cf. Oecumen. on v. 1. Cf. the admonition in Hebrews xiii. 7: "Remember your rulers, who spoke to you the word of God," where St. Paul appears to be exhorting the Hebrews to remember especially St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem; and St. Jude, the brother of St. James, here appears to be exhorting his readers to remember St. Peter and St. Paul."—M.]

VER. 18. **In the last time there shall be**

scoffers, etc.—Jude here evidently has an express reference to the second Epistle of Peter: for the words which he cites, are almost literally found at 2 Pet. iii. 3, the only variation being, first: that Peter says, "there shall come", while Jude has "there shall be." [See above, Appar. Crit. v. 18, 9.—M.]. But the latter expression occurs also in 2 Pet. ii. 1. The second variation is Jude's addition of τῶν ἀσεβειῶν, it being, as we have already seen, (v. 15), his aim to give special prominence to the ungodliness of those men. This verse supplies one of the chief proofs of the priority of the second Epistle of Peter. Even de Wette has to admit that such a prophecy cannot be found any where except in 2 Pet. iii. 3. Huther's statement that these words need not be considered as a literally exact quotation, but that they may be a compression of the various predictions of the Apostles concerning this subject, is an untenable make-shift. Consider, *e. g.*, the peculiar word ἐμπαῖκται, which occurs only here and 2 Pet. iii. 3.

In the last time; ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ. See notes on 2 Peter iii. 3, [cf. Appar. Crit., verse 18. 9.—M.]

In ungodliness.—Literally: "After their lusts turned to ungodliness;" so de Wette: "Lusts of ungodliness" (Stier), because the ground of every lust is nothing but some special ungodliness, denying, mocking and rejecting the divine opposed to that lust.

VER. 19. **These are they who separate** [themselves]. Final description of these men by a third, "*These are.*"

Who separate [themselves].—Ἀποδιορίζειν, to set off by drawing a boundary, to separate. Lachmann and Tischendorf omit ἑαυτούς; in that case we have to translate, "who cause separations, make factions." So de Wette, Luther.—Huther, on the other hand, justly remarks, that had Jude intended to express that idea, he would hardly have satisfied himself with this one word. He considers ἑαυτούς genuine, and expounds: "They who separate themselves from the Church." But this hardly suits the description of those men, v. 12, who boldly pressed forward to the love-feasts of the faithful. The correct explanation follows from the next verse: They tear loose from the faith of the Church, and separate themselves from the Church inwardly, although they cannot be separated outwardly by Church-discipline, and indeed all the circumstances of the case point to the impossibility of such discipline being at that time administered in those Churches. [The different readings have been considered in Appar. Crit., v. 19, note 11. The interpretation of Huther is based on an argument, by no means uncommon among commentators, but most objectionable wherever and whenever advanced. I refer to the supposed intention of the sacred writers, with which these commentators seem to be fully acquainted, although I am at a loss to conjecture how or whence they get that knowledge, and suspect, that an appeal to the intention of the sacred writers is a convenient way of enforcing a peculiar view, or of evading a difficulty. Moreover, every thing depends on the fitness of things, as it appears to each particular mind. Huther and Fronmüller think that if Jude had intended to express the general idea, he would not have confined himself to the use of one word; but others, with their idea of the fitness of things, will think that he selected this one word on account of its expressiveness. The fact is, that he did use only one word, οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, and since the Definite Article with the Participle Present denotes a *habit* and state, the Noun *separatists*, or the verbal form "they who separate," seem to be in exact agreement with the Greek, while the omission of ἑαυτούς, supported by high authority, leaves us free to limit the meaning of ἀποδιορίζοντες to the men themselves, to extend it to others, or to apply it to both. We incline to do the last, and are supported by Oecumen., Clement of Alexandr., Erasmus, Estius ("*Potest absolute sumi*, SEPARANTES, *id est, qui separationem faciunt tam in cœtibus, quam in doctrina.*"), Bloomf., Wordsw., Lillie and others. The ancient *Catena* expounds this word: "Making schisms and rending the members of the Church," and Hooker (Serm. V. 11) specifies three kinds of separations: "Men do separate themselves either by *heresy*, *schism*, or *apostasy*. If they loose the bond of faith, which then they are justly supposed to do, when they frowardly expugn any principal point of Christian doctrine, this is to separate themselves by *heresy*. If they break the bond of unity, whereby the body of the Church is coupled and knit in one, as they do which wilfully forsake all external communion with saints in holy exercises purely and orderly established in the Church, this is to separate themselves by *schism*. If they willingly cast off and utterly forsake both profession of Christ and communion with Christians, taking their leave of all religion, this is to separate themselves by plain *apostasy*."—M.]

Psychical (German "*Seelische*"); ψυχικοί, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 14. 15; xv. 44. 46. Persons in whom the earthly life of the soul rules, and the life of the Spirit with its higher powers is subjugated. Paul describes them as "fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind," Eph. ii. 3. They either live in open sin, or content themselves with outward propriety, while inwardly they are the slaves of pride, avarice, sensuality or other vices. [Alford: "*Sensual.* We have no English word for ψυχικός; and our biblical psychology is, by this defect, entirely at fault. The ψυχή is the centre of the personal being, the 'I' of each individual. It is in each man bound to the spirit, man's higher part, and to the body, man's lower part; drawn upwards by the one, downwards by the other. He who gives himself up to the lower appetites, is σαρκικός: he who by communion of his πνεῦμα with God's Spirit is employed in the higher aims of his being, is πνευματικός. He who rests midway, thinking only of self and self's interests, whether animal or intellectual, is the ψυχικός, the selfish man in whom the spirit is sunk and degraded into subordination to the subordinate ψυχή. In the lack of any adequate word, I have retained the '*sensual*' of the E. V., though the impression which it gives is a wrong one; 'selfish' would be as bad, for the ψυχικός may be an amiable and generous man: '*animal*' would be worse: '*intellectual*,' worse still. If the word were not so ill-looking in our language, '*psychic*' would be a great gain."—'*Animal*' has some merit on account of its connection with *anima;*

see Appar. Crit., v. 19, note 11 *b*. I have rendered "*Seelische*" ψυχικοί, by "*psychical*," which sounds and looks better than "*psychic*," or the Saxon "*soulish*."—Irenæus I., 6. 2–4, reports certain Gnostics of the sub-Apostolic age to have said, "that animal men (ψυχικοί) are conversant only with animal things (ψυχικά), and have not perfect *Gnosis:* and they describe *us* who are of the *Church*, as such; and they say that as *we* are *only* such, *he* must do good works, in order to be saved; but, they assert, that *they* themselves will be saved, not by practice, but because they are *spiritual* (πνευματικοί) *by nature:* and that as gold, though mingled with fire, does not lose its beauty, so they themselves, though wallowing in the mire of carnal works, do not lose their own *spiritual* essence, and therefore, though they eat things offered to idols, and are the first to resort to the banquets which the heathen celebrate in honour of their false gods, and abstain from nothing that is foul in the eyes of God or man, they say that they cannot contract any defilement from these impure abominations; and they scoff at us who fear God, as silly dotards (cf. v. 10), and hugely exalt themselves, calling themselves *perfect*, and the *elect seed;* and they even make lust a virtue, and call us mere *animal* men (ψυχικούς), and say that we stand in need of temperance, in order to come to the pleroma, but that they themselves, who are spiritual and perfect, have no need thereof."—M.]

Having no spirit.—De Wette says the reference lies to the Holy Spirit, although the Article is wanting. Huther understands the expression of higher soul-life wrought by the Spirit. But in either case we should have a most stale summing-up of the characteristics of those animal-minded men. Surely it is self-evident that persons like those here described, cannot have the Spirit of God and the new life and nature of regeneration. The negative μή, moreover, is decidedly opposed to such a supposition. Had Jude intended to convey that idea, he necessarily ought to have used οὐ; for the writers of the New Testament are more precise in this respect than is generally supposed. Winer, p. 494, sqq. μή means: I might say that they have no spirit at all. We might altogether deny their possessing a rational spirit. This is the meaning of πνεῦμα, which, besides body and soul, is one of the constituents of our nature. Hence we may not conclude from this passage, with Bengel, that "the spirit is no essential part of man." On the contrary, it is that which essentially distinguishes man from an animal, a breath from (out of) God, the noblest part of our nature; but as, in the case of all natural men, it lies concealed since the fall in carnal and animal life, it may be so effectually sunk and buried under the flesh by continual sins, as if it were no longer extant. "Conscience at last becomes blunted, almost to annihilation; the mind is dried up and killed, the higher consciousness lowered to a state of mere animal dreaming, the faculty of cognition ceases to exist." Stier. This state of induration was the condition of those animal men without spirit; they had almost reached the level of brutes, cf. v. 10. [Alford: These men have not indeed ceased to have πνεῦμα, as a part of their own tripartite nature: but they have ceased to possess it in any worthy sense: it is degraded beneath and under the power of the ψυχή, the personal life, so as to have no real vitality of its own. See Delitzsch, *Biblische Psychologie*, § 2, "*Das neue Geistesleben;*" and Beck, "*Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre*, p. 85, sqq."—M.]

As contrasted with those men who had wandered so far from the true faith, Jude now exhorts the readers of his Epistle to give the more heed to building themselves up upon their most holy faith (v. 20). The principal exhortation, contained in v. 21, "Keep yourselves in the love of God," is surrounded by three participial sentences, two of which at all events are coördinated, viz., ἐποικοδομοῦντες and προσδεχόμενοι. They indicate the manner how that keeping is to take place. The central Participle προσευχόμενοι may either be joined to the preceding ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ and subordinated to ἐποικοδομοῦντες, or be connected with the sequel. Against the former connection de Wette advances three reasons with which we agree: *a*. The propriety of the thought *per se; b*. The antithesis to the separatistic lusts of those men abandoned by the Holy Spirit (and their own rational spirit); *c*. The trinitarian arrangement of the language: to which we add, *d*. The infrequency of the expression "to pray in the Holy Spirit," which Huther explains as a praying in which the Holy Spirit is the moving and leading power, and in support of which Bengel cites Eph. vi. 18; Zech. xii. 10; John iv. 24. Should it be thought that this construction lessens the force of προσευχόμενοι, its central position admits of its being joined not only to the sequel, but also to the preceding words, provided it be not connected with ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, which would be something different than praying in the Spirit.

VER. 20. **Building up yourselves**, etc.—(German: "*Continue to build up yourselves with prayer on your most holy faith.*")

πίστις here, as in v. 3 and 2 Pet. i. 1, denotes *objective* faith, the truths of faith considered as a whole. This follows from the predicate and the verb, by which faith is qualified. The primary reference in *most holy faith* is antithetical to those unholy scoffers and deceivers, the secondary reference is general, and points to its origin, object and end. "Jude thus addresses the saints just because it is a faith of the sanctified in the thrice Holy One, in whom they are and become holy." Stier.

ἐποικοδομοῦντες, to build upon it, and to build again, cf. οἰκοδομή, 1 Cor. iii. 9. Faith in God and Christ is the foundation on which we must build ourselves up, ever more firmly in all directions, and into which we must ever root ourselves deeper and deeper. The term implies both strengthening and growth, cf. Heb. xii. 28; Col. ii. 6. 7; 2 Pet. i. 5; iii. 18; 1 Pet. ii. 5.

ἑαυτούς not=ἀλλήλους, although that is not excluded. Bengel:—"Who first defends himself, may also save others."

In the Holy Spirit.—In His communion and power, not in reliance on their own wisdom and strength. [We can hardly agree with the construction advocated in the text, and see really no valid objection to προσευχόμενοι being joined with ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.—Fronmüller's artificial arrangement strikes us as unnecessary

and a distinction without a difference. "To pray in the Holy Spirit" is a clear idea, fully borne out by Bengel's references, and in perfect keeping with the rest of the sentence. The *three* participles seem to be coördinated, building, praying and waiting being necessary to keeping ourselves in the love of God; the parallelism, moreover, is perfect, 1, *τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ πίστει ἐποικοδομοῦντες*, 2, *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι*, 3, *προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος κ. τ. λ.* In this trinitarian arrangement, moreover, we have an express reference to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and faith, love and hope grouped round "prayer in the Holy Spirit."—M.]

VER. 21. **Waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.**—The positive expression of the concluding caution of the second Epistle of Peter, "Beware lest ye fall from your own stedfastness." Compare here the repeated exhortations of our Lord to abiding in His love, Jno. xv. 4. 9. While it is true that nothing but the power of God can preserve us unto salvation, cf. 1 Pet. i. 5; 2 Thess. iii. 3; Jno. xvii. 5, it is equally true that we must do our part in this great work of God, and make faithful and good use of our gifts and graces for our sanctification. Hence John says (1 Jno. v. 18), "He that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." "Man also, by exercising himself in the word of God, may strengthen his love to God, and thereby more richly enjoy the love which God has to us." John xiv. 21. Rieger.

In the love of God.—This is the *genitivus subjecti*, in the love which God has to us, in which we are through faith. This explanation agrees best with the verb "keep," and the reference to the mercy of Christ which follows it. Our love to God is kindled by His love to us. Rieger and Richter connect the two ideas.

For the mercy of our Lord.—Cf. Tit. ii. 13. Since *προσδεχόμενοι* points to the future, the allusion is to the mercy by which Christ will glorify Himself in His saints in His great day, cf. 2 Pet. iii. 12–15; Heb. ix. 28; 1 Thess. i. 10; Jas. ii. 13. Its opposite is the fire (v. 23), into which we belong according to our natural state. Even the most advanced Christians confess: "We ask for time and for eternity nothing but mercy."

Unto eternal life.—This may be connected with *ἔλεος*, the saving mercy of Christ conducing to eternal life (de Wette), but the connection with "keep yourselves" seems more natural (Huther). [Hardly as natural as the connection with *προσδεχόμενοι* (Bengel).—M.]—The prominence given here to the Trinity, "Holy Spirit, God, Jesus Christ," should not be overlooked.

VER. 22. **And on some, indeed, have compassion,** etc.—Now follows a direction for the proper treatment of the weak and deceived among the body of believers. The textual criticism of this passage is difficult [see above Appar. Crit., v. 22. 16.—M.]. Adhering to the common reading, the first question relates to the meaning of *διακρινόμενοι*, which signifies in the Middle, *to contend* or *dispute with one*, Acts xi. 2; Jude 9, but also *to be at variance with oneself*, Mtt. xxi. 21; Rom. iv. 20; xiv. 23; Jas. i. 6; in Active sometimes to *prefer, distinguish*, 1 Cor. iv. 7; then *to cause to differ, to discern*, Acts xv. 9; 1 Cor. xi. 29; and lastly, *to judge*, 1 Cor. xi. 31. The passage under notice admits only the sense to distinguish, discern, or separate, which it also bears in classical Greek. The meaning would then be clear, as given in the translation, "Separating them from others," *i. e.*, if you find in some only a spark of the love of Christ, have compassion on them and separate them in your judgment and conduct from others. Stier: "On some have compassion, making a difference, *i. e.*, treating some mildly, others severely."—*ὃς μὲν* and *ὃς δὲ* are often used for *ὁ μὲν* and *ὁ δὲ*. Winer, p. 117. If we adopt, however, the more authentic reading: *οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους*, *διακρίνεσθαι* cannot be taken in the sense of the Vulgate, but either in that of separation (Oecumenius), or better in that of contention. Oecumenius paraphrases: "If they separate themselves from you, before all things reveal their ungodliness." But it is more correct to render: "when they contend with you, convict them, hold up to them their wrong and perverseness." De Wette and Bengel make *διακρινομένους*=to doubt, to hesitate between fidelity to ecclesiastical order and apostasy, and explain the word of the deceived, not the deceivers. Although this distinction is not indicated here, it is evident that the reference cannot be to false teachers, who were described as incorrigible in v. 12, but to weak, contentious and deceived members of the body of believers. Jude from v. 20 onwards, ceases to deal with the false teachers, and refers only to believers. [The New Testament use of the word *διακρίνομαι* in Middle seems to preponderate in favour of "*to doubt*," Acts x. 20; xi. 12; Rom. xiv. 23; Jas. i. 6; the note of Bengel on vv. 22. 23 is as follows: "*Tria genera enumerat apostolus eorum, quorum saluti consulere sancti debeant, ac primum quidem genus intellectu laborat; secundum affectu, vehementer; tertiam affectu, minus vehementer. Itaque* I. ELENCHUS *sive demonstratio boni et mali debet iis, qui eum dubitationibus conflictantur, et in medio antipitique hærent.* II. *Quos* IGNIS *jam prope corripuit, ii rapida vi, quacumque parte prehensi,* SERVARI *debent.* III. MISERICORDITER *et leniter tractandi sunt ii, que metu solo, et benigna periculi demonstratione, in viam reduci possunt.*"—M.]

VER. 23. **But others save in fear,** etc.—*ἐν φόβῳ* is opposed to *ἐλεεῖν*; attack them strongly, influence them by motives of fear and terror; delineate heaven and hell to them. Huther thinks of the fear of the persons engaged in saving them: take heed, lest in the attempt to convert them, ye be drawn over to their side, and fall a prey to their ruin. This yields a good sense, but the former explanation is preferable, the same precaution being necessary in the case of the first class of the deceived. [Doubtful whether the explanation commended by Fronmüller is tenable; the word *fear* seems hardly to describe the disposition of bold assailants, courage would be more apposite. Then the appeal to the fears of the deceived would require *διά* rather than *ἐν*; we prefer, therefore, the interpretation of de Wette: "with conscientious solicitude for the Church's salvation and your own," and Lillie's briefer rendering: "In a spirit of fear." Pricæus in CRIT. SACRI: "*Festinantes et trepidantes: eorum ritu qui aliquid ex flamma rapiunt, salvate eos: θᾶττον, ut loquitur Artemidorus.*"—M.]

Plucking them out of the fire.—Huther understands *πῦρ* of the ruin in which they already find themselves. But this use of fire is not scriptural. Jude had spoken of eternal fire, v. 7, as had Peter in 2 Pet. iii. 7. To that he refers back. Cf. Is. l. 11. "Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks: walk in the light of your fire and in the sparks that ye have kindled." *ἁρπάζειν* denotes, as Huther rightly observes, hasty, almost violent snatching away, and indicates that they were already in extreme peril of perdition. So Joshua, the high-priest, is called "a brand plucked out of the fire." Zech. iii. 2. Cf. Amos iv. 11: "Ye were as a firebrand, plucked out of the burning." Stier refers to wavering Lot, when the angels took him by the hand, and led him away, half by force, from the burning. [Terence, *Andr*. 1. 1. "*Quæ sese in ignem projicere voluit, prohibui, servavi.*"—M.].—The other reading is: *ἐλεᾶτε* (for *ἐλεεῖτε*, see Winer, p. 97) *ἐν φόβῳ μισοῦντες*, where *ἐλεᾶτε* is to be joined to *ἐν φόβῳ*, and the latter to be understood of the caution to be exerted by those engaged in saving. Bengel distinguishes the three classes as given above under v. 22, although, as Stier remarks, they cannot be well distinguished.

Hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.—Their compassion and saving activity must go hand in hand with sincere hatred of evil and every thing that is even outwardly connected with it. "Let not the saving love to the sinner do detriment to the hatred of sin." Stier. Is. lii. 11.

καί, here in the sense of *even*. Hence v. Meyer: "Hate, flee even every outward moral impurity and its infection, not only the inward, the flesh itself, but also the seemingly innocent trace of sin." Bengel: "Hate the contamination which may pass from the flesh of those unclean persons to your *outward* and consequently also to your *inward* conversation."

[Oecumenius: *τῷ ἐλέῳ τῷ πρὸς αὐτοὺς συνεπέσθω τὸ μῖσος τὸ πρὸς τὰ μιαρὰ αὐτῶν ἔργα, μισούντων ὑμῶν καὶ βδελλυσσομένων, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν ἐσπιλωμένον, ἤτοι μεμιασμένον αὐτῶν χιτῶνα, ὡς τῇ πρὸς τὴν αὐτῶν σάρκα προσψαύσει, καὶ αὐτοῦ βδελυροῦ χρηματίζοντος.*—M.]

Χιτών, the tunic or inner robe, worn next to the skin; sometimes, however, it denotes also the outer garb. Here the figure of whatever belongs to the outward appearance of men, their mode of life, habits and manner of speech. [But the *inner* robe, nearest to the person is soiled by the stains of the flesh, that, therefore, ye must *hate* (Wordsw.). "*Animæ videlicet tunica maculata est spiritus concupiscentiis pollutus carnalibus.*" Clem. Alex. The expression of Jude is rather hyperbolical than proverbial. Pricaeus: "ITA APULEIUS, FORMIDANS, AC PROCUL PERHORRESCENS ETIAM IPSAM DOMUM EJUS: *ac si diceret, non tantum abhorrens convivium ad quod vocabatur, sed et aedes ipsas in quibus, illud convivium faciendum erat.*"—M.]

σπιλόω; cf. Jas. iii. 6.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. Flattery, pride and partiality mark the hireling; sincerity, humility and impartiality the true pastor (v. 16, cf. Jno. x. 1–17.) "*Omnis qui adulatur, aut propter avaritiam vel gloriam adulatur.*"

2. The cure of souls, like the practice of medicine, requires a skilful diagnosis of every spiritual disease and judicious treatment. Medicine must be given with reference to the nature of the disease and the constitution of the patient, but the means used must in every case be adjusted to the end, viz.: the salvation of the patient. Seneca: "*Aliter cum alio agendum est.*" Cassiodorus: "*Aegris non una causa salutis est: alter cibis reficitur, alter per abstinentia beneficia tenuatur; hic lavacra mollia, ille ferrum quærit ad vulnera.*"—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The knowledge "that thus it must be" (Mtt. xxvi. 54; Jno. xvi. 1) is an admirable support of faith in affliction.—The spirit of scoffing is here represented as rooted not in the understanding, but in the heart sold to sin. The increase of scoffers belongs to the forerunners of the antichristian time.—"By scoffing men completely break off the sting from God's truth, which may interfere with their life according to their own lusts." RIEGER:—"It is only by standing fast in the faith resting on Apostolical testimony that we are secure against the stormy flood of the unbelief, scoffing and ungodliness of the last times. The hard struggles of Christians at the close of the Apostolical age with the fearful power of unbelief and scoffing are typical of similar conflicts in the last days before the judgment.—Edifying oneself and others is one of the chief duties of Christianity; complaining and disclosing hurts a poor art.—["*Qui sibi jam consuluit, consulat aliis.*" BENGEL.—M.].—The way of separation is displeasing to God, Prov. xviii. 1.—One of the seals of the truth of our religion is its insisting everywhere on holiness. The evangelical Church is built upon the immovable foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, and not on the quicksand of human tradition.—The edifice of Christianity must not only have a firm foundation, but ever be raised higher and firmer.—The only true progress—going to meet eternal life.—Those whe want first to do good works and conduct themselves well, and afterwards to believe in God and put their trust in Him, turn the house upsido down and put the roof on the floor.—If our building is to prosper, it must not be done in our own spirit and strength, but in the Holy Spirit with unceasing prayer.—Prayer the surest and most necessary means for the building of Christianity.—If we have had any experience of the sweetness of the love of God, the monition "Keep yourselves in the love of God" is addressed to us. This is done by opening our hearts to God, by musing on His great Love to us unworthy men, by carefully noting every thing that may hinder or further us in love, and by waiting for the mercy of Christ.—The beginning and the end of evangelical Christianity are alike; every thing from first to last is the result of mercy and grace.—Christianity is an unfathomable sea of the mercies of Jesus Christ. Those who trust themselves to it in penitence and faith will surely reach the haven of eternity.—Suffer yourselves

not to be deprived of your part in this life, but wait for eternal life where the treasures of the mercy of God will be fully opened to you.—If we have found salvation in Christ, we are also seized by the desire of saving others; but we should take hold of every man according to his own peculiar wants.—Take heed lest in saving others thou burn thyself!—["But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away." 1 Cor. ix. 27. —M.].—Divide the word rightly, classify your hearers, although some may not like it.—Our life should be nothing but a constant waiting for and desire of the life to come.

STARKE:—O, the miserableness of the walk after one's own lusts! and yet many, alas!—perhaps thyself also, reader—walk after their own lusts, 1 Tim. vi. 9.—A teacher should deal with his hearers fairly, and, as far as possible, in love, for love often achieves more than the greatest punishment. But if the rod gentleness cannot effect any thing, then it is lawful to use the rod woe, Zech. xi. 7; 1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 24; iv. 2. Scoffing is a most fearful sin, for it makes of God and His word pastime and mockery; it will rarely be seen that such scoffers attain to conversion, but in most instances they will be seen to come to a fearful end.—Would that there were not so many, even of the clergy, of whom we are constrained to say that they are carnal and have no spirit, and cannot please God, Rom. viii. 8. 9. —[A sad reflection on the status of the German clergy in STARKE's time; thank God, things look much better there now, and it is one of the greatest blessings of *this* country that its clergy are conspicuous for godliness of living.—M.].—Living stones must move of their own accord to the building, 1 Pet. ii. 5. Their architect is God, their level His word, their task-master the Holy Ghost, who dwelleth in them. Fair building, proof against fire and war! Rom. xiv. 19.

HEDINGER:—Where faith is the foundation of the Christian edifice, prayer as the fruit of hope, raises it to heaven, and love is its pinnacle and perfection, 1 Cor. xiii. 13.—If the offering of incense is to waft a sweet and grateful odour to God, it must be kindled by heaven-descended fire, Acts ii. 2. 4; Lev. ix. 24; 2 Chron. vii. 1.—Time and people must be distinguished.—The same medicine, be it never so good, does not suit every disease. Would that all sick Christian souls were treated according to their several wants! Let every one in his vocation of love do what he is able to God's eternal praise and glory, 2 Tim. ii. 15.—In the conversion of the ungodly and erring we require special wisdom, that different minds may be treated according to their kind, 1 Cor. iii. 1.—Fire must be removed by fire; although man with all his denunciations is not likely to accomplish much unless God clothe His word with power to strike men with fear and terror, Jer. xxiii. 29.—Sparing and waiting will not do; he that saves a soul is like an angel that plucks it from the hell-fire of Sodom, Jas. v. 20.—Those who would convert others should hate and shun sin. Therefore always begin at home in thy efforts to reprove and improve others, 1 Cor. ix. 27.—How few are ashamed to walk in the eyes of God and His saints in the garb of the old Adam and of sin! Shame! Lord Jesus, clothe Thou me with the robe of Thy innocence and righteousness.

[HOOKER:—VER. 20. As in a chain, which is made of many links, if you pull the first, you draw the rest; and as in a ladder of many staves, if you take away the lowest, all hope of ascending to the highest will be removed; so because all the precepts and promises in the law and the Gospel do hang upon this, *Believe;* and because the last of the graces of God doth not follow the first, that He glorifieth none but whom He hath justified, nor justifieth any but whom He hath called to a true, effectual and lively faith in Christ Jesus, therefore St. Jude exhorting us to *build ourselves*, mentioneth here expressly only faith, as the thing wherein we must be edified; for that faith is the ground and the glory of all the welfare of this building.—The strength of every building which is of God, standeth not in any man's arms or legs; it is only in our faith, as the valour of Samson lay only in his hair. This is the reason why we are so earnestly called upon *to edify ourselves in faith.* Not as if this bare action of our minds, whereby we believe the Gospel of Christ, were able in itself, as of itself, to make us unconquerable and invincible, like stones, which abide in the building forever, and fall not out. No, it is not the *worthiness* of our believing, it is the *virtue of Him* in whom we believe, by which we stand sure, as houses that are built upon a rock. He is a wise man which hath builded his house upon a rock; for he hath chosen a good foundation, and no doubt his house will stand. But how will it stand? Verily, by the strength of the rock which beareth it, and by nothing else.—M.]

Sermon Themes:—

Vv. 17. 18. Reason, not raillery, the proper test of religion. (SHOREY).—The extreme folly and impiety of mocking at religion. (WARREN).

Vv. 20. 21. The spiritual building. (J. TAYLOR).—The principles and prospects of a servant of Christ. (A. FULLER).

Vv. 20–23. Religious errors arising from the abuse of ordinances. (JOHN MILLER).

Vv. 22. 23. Growth in sin, or the several states and degrees of sinners, with the manner how they are to be treated. (JEREMY TAYLOR).

Very valuable are R. HOOKER's two sermons upon part of St. Jude's Epistle, vv. 17–21, an analysis of which may prove suggestive to the reader. He treats of the following subjects: Imperfection of Human Language; Respect of God's Word, the Test of Love to Him; Neutrality in Religion Intolerable; Ridicule of Holy things a Token of Unbelief; Three Ways by which Men separate from Christ; Our Conduct shows whether we are of the Body; The Papists Charge us with Apostasy; Comparison of Popery with the System of Jeroboam; How the Gospel Spiritualizes our Natural Instincts; Extravagant Building; Edification must begin from Faith; Case of Israel a Warning to the Gentiles; Foolishness of the Roman Doctrine of Merit; Edification depends much on Good Pastors; etc., etc. —M.]

VERSES 24, 25.

CONTENTS:—Conclusion and Doxology.

24 Now[1] unto him that is able to keep you[2] from falling, and to present[3] *you* faultless
25 before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, To the only wise[4] God our Saviour,[5] *be* glory and[6] majesty, dominion and power,[7] both now and ever.[8] Amen.

Verse 24. [[1] δέ, *but*, better than *now*; δέ here introduces an important thought, and is tantamount to: "False teachers may seek for glory elsewhere, *but you* will ascribe it all to God through Christ." Wordsworth.—M.]

[2] Tischendorf reads αὐτοὺς applying to the deceived. De Wette says that this difficult reading ought to be preferred. He thinks that the author, soaring in devotion, turns, as it were, away from the readers, and yet means them. Untenable. If αὐτοὺς is genuine, it would confirm the view that vv. 22. 23 refer to deceived believers. [ὑμᾶς is the reading of C. G., Rec., Elz., Lachm., Vulg., Syr., Arab., Æthiop., al.—M.]

[[3] στῆσαι, German: *stellen*, to set. "The only instance, out of 19, in which a transitive form of ἵστημι is translated *present* in E. V." Lillie.—M.]

Verse 25. [4] σόφῳ, omitted in A. B. C. Sin., and rejected by Griesb., Scholz., Lachm., Tischend., al.; it has probably crept in from 1 Tim. i. 17; Rom. xvi. 27. [German retains it.—M.]

[5] Griesbach and other reliable authorities add: διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. So Tischendorf. [It is found in A. B. C., Sin., G., al., and is therefore the authentic reading.—M.]

[[6] καὶ after δοξά cancelled by Lachm., Tischend., Meyer, Peyle, Wordsworth, al. It is wanting in Cod. Sin.—M.]

[7] Griesbach and others add after ἐξουσία, πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος. Comprehensive description of eternity. Tischendorf pronounces the reading well-authenticated. [It is found in A. B. C., Cod. Sin., G., received by Scholz, Lachm., Tischend., Alford, Wordsworth, al., but not adopted by Fronmüller; it is the most authentic reading.—M.]

[[8] εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, literally, "unto all the ages," Germ.: "unto all eternities." The Italian, *tutti i secoli*, and the French, '*tous les siècles*,' are the most literal versions.

[German of both verses:—"But to Him that is able to keep you inoffensively, and to set you before the face of His glorious majesty unblamable with exceeding joy, to the only wise God be glory and highness, strength and power both now and in all eternities. Amen."

[Translate:—"But to Him that is able to keep you from falling and to set *you* in the presence of His glory faultless with exceeding joy, to the only God our Saviour through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, strength and authority, before all eternity, and now and unto all the ages. Amen."—M.]

[[9] THE SUBSCRIPTION:—Ἰουδα επιστολη χαθολιχη. C. al.: του αγιου αποστολου ιουδα επιστολη. L. al.: ετελειωθη συν θεω και η του ιουδα χαθολιχη επιστολη. δοξα σοι ο θεος, ο θεος, ο θεος, ο μαχροθυμων επ' εμοι τω αναξιω δουλω σου. K.: Ἰουδα επιστολη. A.: Ἰουδα B., Sin. Omitted by many Cursives.—M.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 24. **But to Him that is able**, etc.—The praise of God blends with the comfortable assurance that God can and will keep them even to His throne.

τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ; this conclusion greatly resembles that in Rom. xvi. 25. Verse 21 might suggest the doubt "Shall we succeed to keep ourselves in the love of God?" This doubt Jude solves by his reference to the power of God.

To keep you; ὑμᾶς φυλάξαι. Protect you from the perils of seduction, and preserve you in love, v. 21; cf. 2 Thess. iii. 3. [Alford: "The occurrence of αὐτούς (which is almost beyond doubt the true reading instead of ὑμᾶς of Rec. or ἡμᾶς of A), can only be accounted for by the supposition that St. Jude writes here, as of all to whom he has been addressing himself, in the third person, as if he was praying to God for them. His reason for not using ὑμᾶς may have been his desire to include also in the term those who might be convicted, rescued from the fire, and compassionated, as well as his more immediate reader. But it is hardly likely, in the solemn close of his Epistle, that he should mean by αὐτοὺς those *only*."—M.]

From falling; ἄπταιστος, found only here, from πταίω, to stumble or strike against, cf. 2 Peter i. 10; James iii. 2; ii. 10. Stier: "Who does not make or has not made a false step in his walk."

In the presence of His glory; cf. 2 Peter i. 17. A special manifestation of it will take place at Christ's coming to judgment.

Set; in that decisive day He will set them on His right hand and own them as His own, 2 Thess. i. 7. 10; Matt. xxv. 33; 1 Cor. vi. 2. 3; Rev. i. 5. 6; iii. 21; v. 10.

Faultless; ἄμωμος, Eph. i. 4; v. 27; Col. i. 22; Heb. ix. 14; 1 Pet. i. 19; Rev. xiv. 5. Without the stains of sin, so that even the devil, the arch-blamer, cannot reproach them with any thing, after they have been cleansed and washed, cf. 2 Peter iii. 14; Phil. ii. 15.

With exceeding joy.—ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει, cf. 1 Peter iv. 13; i. 6–9; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Rev. xix 7.

VER. 25. **To the only (wise) God**, etc.—**Amen.**

μόνῳ, cf. 1 Tim. i. 17; Rom. xvi. 27; applies to God the Father, cf. John xvii. 3; Rev. xv. 14.

Our Saviour.—A predicate of God the Father, as the above-mentioned clause διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν is probably genuine, as in 1 Tim. ii. 3, and as the Father is called in the Old Testament Saviour and Redeemer, 1 Sam. xiv. 39; Ps. cvi. 21; 2 Sam. xxii. 3; 1 Chron. xvii. 35. He is our Saviour through the mediation of the Son, for διά belongs to σωτῆρι, not to the sequel, cf. Tit. i. 3; ii. 10; iii. 4. [See Appar. Crit., v. 25, note 5.—M.]

Glory (and) majesty.—[See Appar. Crit., v. 25, 6.—M.], c. 2 Peter iii. 18; Rom. xi. 36; xvi. 27; Rev. i. 6. *μεγαλωσύνη*, cf. Deut. xxxii. 3, LXX. = גֹּדֶל Heb. i. 3; viii. 1. His wonderful greatness, as He is called in Scripture the Highest and Most High.

κράτος (German: *power*), strength. According to Roos, the essential, immovable strength of the Divine Being, which fainteth not, neither grows weary (Isa. xl. 28).

ἐξουσία [German: *might*), authority. His sovereignty, lordship and rule of all things. *δόξα* and *κράτος* are also found close together, 1 Peter iv. 11; v. 11; Rev. i. 6; v. 13. Each of these attributes occurs in connection with one related to it. Stier defines the sense as follows: "The glorious majesty and the greatness of the love of God is praised for the good out of His fulness given, restored and preserved to His own; His mighty power is praised for the conquest of evil unto the victory of salvation attending the former." We have probably to supply *ἔστω*, as 1 Peter iv. 11.

Amen, similar to the conclusion of other doxologies, Rom. i. 25; 2 Peter iii. 18; so it is; it is assuredly true.

[The clauses *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν* and *πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος* have an important bearing, the first being "directed against heretics who separated Jesus from Christ, and did not acknowledge Him as the Giver of all grace from God;" the second as "asserting the eternal preexistence of Christ against the false teachers." (Wordsworth): from the latter, says Lillie, may be derived the liturgical formula: "*As it was in the beginning.*"—M.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Rieger:—"That which is impossible with men, is possible with God, who gladly uses His Divine power both in the first wakening of faith, Eph. i. 19, and in keeping us to the end, John x. 28." "For the good wrought in and by the accomplishment of His purpose of grace, honour and majesty are due to Him; for the evil conquered in and by the same power and might be ascribed to Him. *Faith* ascribes this doxology *now*, and *hope* is assured that there will be abundant cause for it throughout eternity."

Starke:—God can do all things by His grace; this is the consolation of His elect and servants, Phil. iv. 13.—O, eagerly-desired sight of the glory of Christ! Moses desired to see it in this life, and I cherish the same desire; but a sinful, guilty, mortal man may not see it, but in eternity I shall see it and not another, 1 John iii. 2; Ps. xlii. 3, [cf. Job xix. 27.—M.].—All the doings of men are evil, if they aim not at the spread of the honour and glory of God, 1 Cor. x. 31.